

Central Labor Council, favoring the repeal of the zone postal system for periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of Local Union No. 69, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, Millinocket, Me., protesting against the Senate amendment to H. R. 10358; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to the treatment of spies and enemy agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Eastport Woman's Club, of Eastport, Me., for repeal of zone-rate system on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution adopted by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in regard to the development of foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions adopted by the California State Medical Society, in regard to the rehabilitation of injured persons; to the Committee on Education.

Also, telegram by Howard Robertson, president board of public service commissioners, Los Angeles, Cal., indorsing bills relating to water supply of city of Los Angeles, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 11429; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Idaho Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, urging the enactment of House bill 9563 providing for increased rank in the Medical Service of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 6, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, we praise Thee for Thy boundless mercy. In all the past Thou hast dealt with us most graciously. Thou hast favored our land from the very beginning, when we built an altar unto the Lord. Thou hast given us great prosperity and our commerce has blessed the world. But alas, in the enjoyment of our abundance, we have too often forgotten Thee and gone after other gods. We have forgotten the source whence cometh our help, and now Thou art reminding us of our folly, and the thought of Thy goodness is leading us to repentance. Thou art calling us back to Thyself. Thou art calling us into service for the benefit of mankind and for the preservation of the principles that pertain to Thy kingdom.

O God, may we heartily respond to the call of Thy providence. May we be glad to turn our vast treasures back to Thee and to lay all we have upon the altar of sacrifice. Our thought, our money, our skill, our prayers, ourselves—may we give all to Thee for service in the cause of righteousness and for the restoration of peace to a long-distracted world. We ask it for the sake of Jesus, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, May 2, 1918, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by C. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10264. An act to prevent in time of war departure from or entry into the United States contrary to the public safety; and

H. R. 11185. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think Senators will agree that the pride one has in the good achievements of his own State is quite pardonable. I hold in my hand a clipping showing what my State has done in the matter of liberty-loan subscriptions. I think it worthy a place in the Record. It reflects not only the spirit of South Dakota but the spirit of the West generally. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read from the desk.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Sioux City Journal.]

A NEIGHBOR'S GRACIOUS COMPLIMENT.

All you have to do for South Dakota is to give her a mark to shoot at. In the first liberty-loan campaign the organizers of the drive in the ninth reserve district, having an opinion of South Dakota resources

and of her will to use them that must look sort of funny now, asked the State to subscribe a million and a half. The State did, plus enough to bring the total up to almost \$4,000,000. In the second liberty-loan effort South Dakota was asked to produce ten millions. The figure actually reached was close to \$13,000,000. Along came the third bond issue, and the gentlemen at the Minneapolis headquarters, gulping noticeably, suggested that \$22,000,000 would be about right.

South Dakotans, including those particular South Dakotans on whom responsibility for scraping up the \$22,000,000 of loose change chiefly devolved, gulped, too, and asked Minneapolis what was the matter. As soon as explanations were made, however, the drive began. And, lo, just as the first \$1,500,000 allotment was raised and bettered, just as the second \$10,000,000 quota was bettered, too, so the third sum, being \$22,000,000, was produced without turning a coyote's hair. It is expected that something like \$28,000,000 will be South Dakota's bit in this effort, as South Dakota herself perceives it.

Now hymns of praise are being sung in the citadel. A. B. Rogers, ninth district campaign director, is acting in a way as choir-master. The sense of the song is something like "South Dakota Ueber Alles," though of course nobody would think of expressing it in just that fashion. Among the things that the State has done, it appears, are these:

She was the first State in the district to report officially to the Federal reserve bank an oversubscription of the allotment.

She obtained probably the highest percentage of distribution, population considered, in the district.

She subscribed more generously than any other State of the district, resources considered.

She exceeded her subscription to the second loan by a greater percentage than any other State in the Nation, the increase being more than 100 per cent.

Perhaps conflicting claims will be offered by other States with regard to these points of superiority. That will not make any essential difference. South Dakota assuredly has seen her duty and has done it. Not that there was any real question about that. Indeed, there was none. There is no need to call attention to the performance of Iowa along the same line. And Sioux City can not bear any longer to mention her own humble achievements. But it's a pretty comfortable corner of God's country out here. The New York press may be expected to throw another surprise and happy fit to discover that the West is still, with both feet, in the war. We shan't. With us it's a commonplace.

Bring on your loans.

Mr. GALLINGER. In connection with the article just read, Mr. President, I want to say that the little State of New Hampshire has also oversubscribed the loan and is ready for another.

Mr. President, I have had a great many telegrams in reference to a provision in the naval appropriation bill, to which I offered an amendment, which is now in print and before the committee, proposing to strike out a provision known, I think, as the Taylor efficiency system, which has been placed in bills heretofore, and which it is proposed to place in the naval appropriation bill. I have simply taken from my desk four or five telegrams from business concerns, mostly in my own State, and I ask that they may be inserted in the Record without reading.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MANCHESTER, N. H., April 30, 1918.

Senator JACOB GALLINGER.

Washington, D. C.:

We strenuously condemn antiefficiency rider penalizing bonus and premium payments and time studies in naval appropriation bill just passed. Trust you will use your every influence against similar rider in Senate bill.

LEWIS DEXLER.

DOVER, N. H., April 30, 1918.

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We note the naval appropriation bill with antiefficiency rider attached has been passed by the House. In view of the absolute necessity of speeding up operations, we most earnestly protest against passage of bill with this rider by the Senate. Sincerely hope it will have your active opposition.

B. WILLIAMS & SONS.

NEWPORT, N. H., April 30, 1918.

Senator JACOB H. GALLINGER,

Washington, D. C.:

We enter our protest against the antiefficiency rider in naval appropriation bill. We feel that at this time every effort should be used to increase rather than diminish the country's producing capacity.

EMERSON PAPER CO.

MILFORD, N. H., May 3, 1918.

JACOB H. GALLINGER,

Washington, D. C.:

The antiefficiency rider penalizing premium and bonus payments was surely made in Germany. Our boys across the water are crying, "Speed up." Can't you hear them? We look to our Senators to protect them and us from such vicious legislation.

FRENCH & HEALD CO.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, concerning the allotment of liberty bonds and subscriptions therefor in the several States, to which Senators have been referring, I could have made an announcement of this kind on the second day of the loan, which I will now do. In one of the counties of Tennessee, that of Unicoi, on the first day, before 9 o'clock in the morning, double the quota of the county was subscribed, and I have no doubt that exceeds the record of any other county in the United States. There are no more loyal people in the Union than those of Tennessee, and the prompt action of Unicoi County fairly represents the spirit prevailing all over our State.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I have felt modest about claiming good things for the Green Mountain State, but I feel that it is

In order this morning to state that of all the New England States Vermont was the first to go over the top in regard to the third liberty loan. May I say also that barring the State of Delaware, Vermont was the first of all the New England and the Atlantic States to overgo her allotment.

Mr. RANDELL. I present resolutions unanimously adopted at the State Teachers' Association, Baton Rouge, La., April 6, petitioning Congress to support the Federal amendment giving suffrage to women. I ask that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolutions unanimously adopted at the State Teachers' Association at Baton Rouge, La., on April 6, 1918.

Whereas we are faced with new problems and new issues, and the Nation is realizing its dependency on women as never before: Therefore be it

Resolved, That they can serve still more efficiently when they shall have received a full measure of citizenship. Be it further

Resolved, That the time has come when the enfranchisement of women by means of amendments to the Federal or State constitutions is an act necessary to do justice to all the people of our Nation.

Mr. RANDELL. I also present a telegram from the president of the Eighth District, Federation of Women's Clubs, of Natchitoches, La., urging Congress to adopt the suffrage amendment, and expressing the hope that Senator GUION will vote for it. I ask that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NATCHITOCHES, LA., April 30, 1918.

Senator JOSEPH E. RANDELL,
Washington, D. C.:

The Eighth District Federation of Women's Clubs, in convention assembled, urge the United States Senate to pass the suffrage amendment to the National Constitution and it be read into the Record. We earnestly express the hope that Senator WALTER GUION will vote for it.

Mrs. C. V. PORTER,

President Eighth District Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. RANDELL. I wish to present a telegram from Mr. McMahon showing the subscriptions of the New Orleans Great Northern Railroad to the third liberty loan. With a great deal of pleasure he announces 100 per cent subscription, amounting to \$55,000—733 officers and employees, 300 of whom are colored. I ask that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., April 30, 1918.

Hon. JOSEPH E. RANDELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As chairman New Orleans Great Northern Railroad, third liberty loan campaign, it is with great deal of pleasure I announce 100 per cent subscription, amounting to \$55,000—733 officers and employees, 300 of whom are colored.

M. J. McMAHON.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I present a resolution adopted by the citizens of Columbus, Ga., urging that the influence of the Representatives and Senators from Georgia be used in behalf of war-time prohibition, and also a somewhat similar communication from the Georgia Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which contains among other things a request for the immediate enactment by Congress of war prohibition measures.

I wish to call their attention and the attention of the public to the fact that Congress has already passed legislation prohibiting the manufacture of spirituous liquors and has left to the President the authority to limit the manufacture of beer and vinous liquors.

Congress has acted, and while I gladly present the resolution, what has been done by Congress should be known:

Resolved by the citizens of Columbus, Ga., in mass meeting assembled, That the food, fuel, and transportation administrator be, and is hereby, urged to use his influence in behalf of war-time prohibition.

Resolved, second, That the chairman of this meeting write to the United States Senators from Georgia and to our Representative in Congress, Hon. WILLIAM C. WRIGHT, and urge them to do all in their power to bring about war-time prohibition.

Resolved, third, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Food Administrator, Senators, and Representative.

GEORGIA WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
Macon, Ga., April 27, 1918.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,
United States Senator of Georgia,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In behalf of the conservation of food, fuel, and man power, the promotion of civic righteousness, morals, and the spread of Christianity we, the Woman's Missionary Society of Centenary Methodist Church, of Macon, Ga., urge that you use your influence and vote—

First, for the immediate enactment by Congress of war prohibition measure.

Second, for the bill for prohibition in Hawaii during the period of the war.

Mrs. J. M. BASS, President,
Mrs. A. J. BARNES, Secretary.

Mr. SMOOT. There has been sent to me a copy of a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Utah Branch of the National

Woman's Party with the request that I have it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask that that be done.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution adopted at a meeting of the Utah Branch of the National Woman's Party, held at the Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, on April 20, 1918.

Whereas the Federal suffrage amendment has passed the House of Representatives and is before the Senate for consideration;

Whereas President Wilson has given the measure his support in the House of Representatives and all political parties, either in their platforms or by action of their national committees, have indorsed the amendment;

Whereas the foreign diplomatic policy of the administration is demanding the establishment of representative governments in all countries; Whereas our allies are enfranchising women in war time by national action, and "we can not afford to lag behind our allies on this democratic issue";

Resolved, That we, members of the Utah Branch of the National Woman's Party, at a meeting held in the Hotel Utah on April 20, 1918, ask the President to give the measure his active support in the Senate by urging its speedy passage; further be it

Resolved, That all administration leaders be urged to use their influence to secure the speedy passage of the measure, and that Senator SMOOT and Senator KING, of Utah, be urged to give the amendment their strong support; finally be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all administration leaders and to the Senators from Utah with the request that it be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

LOUISE M. GARNETT,
Chairman of Meeting.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Butte County Medical Society, of Chico, Cal., praying for advanced rank for officers of the Medical Corps of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fowler, Cal., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LEWIS presented a resolution adopted by the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association, of Chicago, Ill., pledging their allegiance to the United States in the prosecution of the war and their support to the Constitution of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. POMERENE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9248) to prevent extortion, to impose taxes upon certain incomes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the bill (S. 3438) to prevent corrupt practices in the election of Senators, Representatives, or Delegates in Congress, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 426) thereon.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3261) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Alonzo W. Livingston, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 10850. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war (Rept. No. 427); and

H. R. 10924. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors (Rept. No. 424).

Mr. SIMMONS, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11245) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and an act in amendment thereto, approved October 6, 1917, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 429) thereon.

ARMY CHAPLAINS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 4409) to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 15. Chaplains: The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, chaplains in the Army at the rate of not to exceed, including chaplains now in the service, one for each 1,200 officers and men in all branches of the Military Establishment, with rank, pay, and allowances as now authorized by law: *Provided*, That there shall be assigned at least one chaplain for each regiment of Cavalry, Infantry, Field Artillery, and Engineers: *Provided further*, That the persons appointed under this act shall be duly accredited by some religious denomination or organization and of good standing therein, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *And provided further*, That no person shall be appointed chaplain in the Army who on the date of appointment is more than 45 years of age."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will state that a similar bill passed the House and Senate and was signed by both the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, but was vetoed by the President, because he thought the last provision in the bill was susceptible of a wrong construction. He therefore suggested an amendment, which we have inserted in the bill now and report it back favorably.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFUND OF DUTIES ON MATERIALS DESTROYED.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on the 30th of April, by direction of the Committee on Finance, I reported back favorably the bill (S. 2496) for the refund of duties paid on materials destroyed by fire. It is Calendar No. 372. Since then I have had a conference with one of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, who calls my attention to certain features of the claim to which our attention had not been before directed, at least mine was not, and which make a material difference concerning the equities of the measure. I therefore ask that the bill be taken from the calendar and referred back to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 4498) to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

A bill (S. 4499) for the relief of Thurman A. Poe; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 4500) to amend paragraph 4, chapter 362, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being an act to make appropriations for the sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 4501) to amend section 2240 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, fixing the salaries of registers and receivers of the United States Land offices; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4502) authorizing the Yakima Indians, of Washington, to file suit in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FALL:

A bill (S. 4503) to reimburse Ben D. Haines, postmaster at Hill, N. Mex., for loss of postal funds and postage stamps; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4504) granting an increase of pension to William L. Butler; to the Committee on Pensions.

ESTIMATED REVENUES FOR 1917.

Mr. POMERENE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 239), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, directed to furnish the Senate with a statement of the revenues estimated for the calendar year of 1917, derived from existing revenue laws, stating particularly the amounts collectible under each title of said several laws.

SALE OF MILITARY SUPPLIES.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I submit a conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate bill 3303, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3303) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property, heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States, in connection with, or incidental to, the prosecution of the war, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same.

GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,

G. M. HITCHCOCK,

F. E. WARREN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. H. DENT, Jr.,

W. J. FIELDS,

JULIUS KAHN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report?

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 10204. An act to prevent, in time of war, departure from or entry into the United States contrary to the public safety, was read twice by its title, and, on motion of Mr. KING, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 11185. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUNISHMENT OF UNLAWFUL ASSOCIATIONS.

Mr. WALSH. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4471) to declare unlawful associations purposing by force, violence, or injury to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change in the United States, and prescribing punishment for persons engaged in the activities of such associations, and for other purposes. The bill comes from the Committee on the Judiciary with a unanimous report, and as I do not conceive that there will be any objection to the bill, I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the bill may be read, though I do not think I have any objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any association, organization, society, or corporation, one of whose purposes or professed purposes is to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change within the United States by the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or by threats of such injury, or which teaches, advocates, advises, or defends the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, to accomplish such change or for any other purpose, and which, during any war in which the United States is engaged, shall by any means prosecute or pursue such purpose or professed purpose, or shall so teach, advocate, advise, or defend, is hereby declared to be an unlawful association.

Sec. 2. That any person who, while the United States is engaged in war, shall act or profess to act as an officer of any such unlawful association, or who shall speak, write, or publish, as the representative or professed representative of any such unlawful association, or become or continue to be a member thereof, or who shall contribute anything as dues or otherwise to it or to anyone for it, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years or by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 3. That any person who, while the United States is engaged in war, knowingly prints, publishes, edits, issues, circulates, sells, or offers for sale, or distributes any book, pamphlet, picture, paper, circular, card, letter, writing, print, publication, or document of any kind in which is taught, advocated, advised, or defended, or who shall in any manner teach, advocate, advise, or defend the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, as a means of accomplishing any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change, or otherwise, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years or by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Sec. 4. That any owner, agent, or superintendent of any building, room, premises, or place who knowingly permits therein any meeting of any such unlawful association, or of any subsidiary or branch thereof, or, during any war in which the United States may be engaged, any assemblage of persons who teach, advocate, advise, or defend the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person

or property, or threats of such injury, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than one year or by a fine of not more than \$500, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I do not think I have any objection to the bill, but it is a very drastic measure, and I wish that the Senator from Montana would give some explanation of it. I have only heard it read hurriedly, but I can see that there are certain provisions of the bill which are really very drastic.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is very clearly disclosed in its language. It is intended to outlaw any organization or association which teaches, advises, advocates, or defends the use of force or violence or physical injury to person or property for the accomplishment of any changes in the United States economically, industrially, or politically. I did not conceive that there would be any objection whatever to the enactment of a statute of this character at this time. The occasion which gives rise to it, of course, is known to all of the Senators present.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course I have no objection to any legislation which will reach only organizations or persons which advocate doing anything that is unlawful or something that should not be done or something that will hamper the prosecution of the war; but in the reading of the bill I observe that it includes any association, organization, society, or corporation, one of whose purposes or professed purposes is to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change within the United States by the use, without authority of law, and so forth. Of course I am willing that any organization which is not a legitimate or lawful organization should be forbidden; I do not think that any such association as that should exist; but, I say to the Senator from Montana in all seriousness, I have not had time even to read the bill, and that is why I asked for an explanation of it.

I agree with the Senator from Montana that something should be done to stop and to punish any association, organization, or person that will commit any unlawful act or do anything that will hamper the war in any particular. I am in perfect accord with the Senator in that respect. I do not think, however, that legislation should be hastily passed that will do an injustice to any person, association, or organization having for their or its purpose to do what is lawful and what will result in good to humanity.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from North Dakota will perceive from reading the bill that it reaches only such associations as teach, advocate, advise, or defend the use of force or violence, or injury to person or property for the accomplishment of its ends. If an association does not teach that, it will not fall within the condemnation of the bill. No association, no matter what its character, if it does not teach that kind of heresy—I might properly say "treason"—is included within the condemnation of the bill at all. The bill also makes membership in an organization of that character, or acting as the representative of it or talking for it a crime. The idea is to outlaw any organization that professes purposes of that character.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the Senator from Montana for his courtesy in explaining the bill, and I will say to him that I have no objection to its passage, if it reaches only such persons, associations, or organizations as he has mentioned.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana whether, in his opinion, this bill, if passed, would give the United States courts jurisdiction over those engaged in lynchings or those who should defend lynchings?

Mr. WALSH. I should think probably it would.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know that I am opposed to the bill, but it opens rather a new field for the giving jurisdiction to courts of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska to repeat his question? I should like to understand the Senator's question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I inquired of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], in charge of the bill, whether, in his opinion, the bill if passed would give to Federal courts jurisdiction over all cases against men charged with lynching or cases against men who defended lynching, and the Senator has replied that, in his opinion, it would, whatever the cause of the lynching might be.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Montana has given more consideration to the matter than have I, and I have great

respect for his judgment; but, in my opinion, the proposed law does not go that far. However, in that I may be in error.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho will pardon me for just a moment, I should like to amplify my statement by saying that the bill is aimed primarily at organizations and associations the purpose of which is to bring about these results, and an organization to bring about such results by lynching would undoubtedly fall within the condemnation of the bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator from Montana will yield for a question, does not the Senator think, however, that the third section of the bill goes a good deal further than that?

Mr. WALSH. The third section of the bill is intended to reach individuals who do not belong to associations, but who teach exactly the same doctrines that we seek to condemn when urged by associations.

Mr. HARDWICK. Suppose an individual were to advocate lynching, or suppose some man should go out and say "Let us lynch these pro-Germans or spies," or whatever they may be?

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; he would fall within the condemnation of this bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is why I think the Senator is right on account of the third section of the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am familiar with section 3, and I have no doubt at all that it would not reach such a case. The whole bill has another object in view, and it will have to be construed as a whole. I have no objection to reaching that particular individual, if the bill will reach him; but if the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Georgia want to reach that individual, in my opinion, they had better offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. President, I only desire to say in regard to this measure, that I supported it in the committee and I support it now as a war measure. I am perfectly willing in these times and in this supreme exigency to deal with this situation through the strong arm of the Government; but I would not want, Mr. President, by my support of the bill to be committed to the idea that the problem of the Industrial Workers of the World or any other labor problem can finally and ultimately be settled through the strong arm of the Government or through force. I think that the remedy will have to be a different remedy than that which might be incorporated in a measure of this kind. At the present juncture of affairs, and in this exigency, I know of no other way to deal with it immediately and effectively than in this particular way; but the time will come when we will have to choose our methods and our remedy with more patience and after greater investigation and with greater wisdom than the mere passing of a criminal statute. As I have said, while I am perfectly willing to support the bill as a war measure, and for the purpose of dealing with the evil in this crisis, it by no means commits me to the policy of dealing with the situation as a permanent proposition in this way. The disease must have a broader, more humane, and patient treatment. We must remove some of the causes before we expect the trouble to disappear.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will permit an inquiry, does not the Senator from Montana think that there ought to be some provision in this bill that would make nonmailable the publications referred to in section 3 of the measure? The Senator will remember that there is a bill pending before the Judiciary Committee which I introduced some time ago, relating to the use of the mails by organizations of the character contemplated by this bill. It was referred to a subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], and myself. The present bill was reported by the subcommittee. In the subcommittee the question was considered whether any provision should be incorporated in the measure which was being prepared that would deny the use of the mail to publications emanating from the criminal organizations denounced in this bill. The members of the subcommittee concluded not to attempt any legislation of such a character as a part of this measure, but I reserved the right to offer an amendment to cover this point when the bill was being considered in the Senate. It seems to me that there ought to be some provision here that would deny the use of the mails to the poisonous, disloyal, and treasonable matter referred to in section 3; and, if it will not prevent the immediate passage of the bill or impede it in any way, I should be glad to offer an amendment having for its object the exclusion from the mails of all publications and printed matter to which reference is made in section 3.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah knows that I am not at all averse to the idea which he expresses, that there ought to be a provision which would make matter of this kind unmailable, and authorize its exclusion from the mails.

I voted for such a provision when the espionage bill was under consideration recently; but I am satisfied, and the Senator from Utah can not be unaware, that there is a very decided difference of opinion in this body on that subject, and I very much fear that the precipitation of that question would delay very much, if not defeat, the passage of the bill. I hope, therefore, that we may have that question reserved for consideration as an independent measure.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not want to do anything, of course, that would interfere with the speedy passage of this bill. I believe, however, that an amendment such as I am about to read will not be objectionable, will not provoke discussion, and will be accepted by every Senator. What I suggest is as follows:

Sec. 5. Every publication and paper referred to in section 3 of this act is hereby declared to be nonmailable matter, and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post office or by any letter carrier.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the espionage act as amended does not cover every conceivable phase of the discussion of this war from every conceivable standpoint, I do not know how it can be covered.

Mr. President, I am anxious to see this bill pass; but if there is going to be any adding to the dictatorial power of the Postmaster General in this situation, it can not pass to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Nor to-morrow.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Idaho, in my opinion, is entirely unwarranted. There have been no dictatorial powers conferred in the espionage act upon the Postmaster General, and the proposed amendment would not confer any dictatorial powers upon the Post Office Department, and the Senator from Idaho must know it.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Idaho is perfectly aware of what he said, and he has no modification whatever to make. He knows precisely the language that was used in that bill, and he has to say that nothing additional will be added to this bill to-day.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Idaho can pursue such course as he may desire, and he may, if he desires, prevent—because I do not want to impede the passage of the bill by the tendering of this amendment—but obviously this amendment ought to be accepted by everyone who desires to see a needed law properly enforced and manifest evils corrected. It is not sufficient to punish criminally those who violate the law, but the Government ought not to be required to convey through the mails their treasonable and incendiary publications. If the Senator from Idaho objects to the criminal, disloyal, and seditious publications referred to in section 3 being excluded from the mails, he must reconcile his course with his own conscience. I shall not offer the amendment at the present time.

Mr. BORAH. I have no difficulty at all in dealing with my own conscience. I simply desire to say that I have no desire to see such material go through the mails of the United States; but I have a desire that the question as to whether or not it is that kind of material shall be determined in accordance with the established principles of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence and justice. That is the position which I take in regard to it. I do not want these things to be determined through wholly ex parte arbitrary methods.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator from Montana a question, in lines 6 and 7 the words "without authority of law" are inserted. Can it be possible that we have a law that would authorize the use of force, violence, or physical injury in a case of this kind? Are not those words unnecessary, and do they not at least suggest that there might be a law that would justify the use of force or violence for the purposes here forbidden?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the language he speaks of was the subject of some consideration both by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and by the full committee. It was proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], a member of the subcommittee, who suggested that under certain circumstances the life of a citizen may be taken legally, or property may be destroyed legally. For instance, under many prohibition statutes liquor, being contraband, is seized and destroyed, and thus property is injured. He was apprehensive that without some language of this kind it would be contended that some of those statutes would be abrogated and that it would be made a crime to injure property or person, even though some other statute authorized it to be done, and out of abundance of caution this language was inserted.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I do not apprehend that the words will do any harm, and yet it strikes me that it is strange phraseology to say—

Any association, organization, society, or corporation, one of whose purposes or professed purposes is to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change within the United States by the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury.

I am not a lawyer, and, of course, can not undertake to discuss the legal meaning of that language; but, in reading it, it struck me as a suggestion that we might enact a law that would permit these things, which, of course, I think is not at all probable to say the least. However, I will not insist upon the suggestion.

Mr. WALSH. I feel at liberty to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that my own ideas coincided very much with his.

Mr. GALLINGER. It can do no harm, Mr. President, and yet I felt like calling attention to it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, primarily this bill is designed to prevent associations advocating change by force and lawlessness from carrying out their purposes and avowed objects during times of war. The bill limits its operation to the continuance of the war. I very much regret that it is so limited, in so far as it affects these associations. I have long been apprehensive regarding the effect upon society and the safety of person and property of a certain criminal organization which has been permitted by the nonaction of the States to assume somewhat formidable proportions and which has become one of the most effective agencies of the enemies of the United States not only in the dissemination of propaganda, but in the use of what members of the society are very fond of calling "direct action" against many of our industrial units. It violates the law both of God and of man in the attempted execution of its purposes to set aside all social conventions and to create anarchy wherever it is possible. They have in some instances obtained possession of local official positions designed for the safeguarding of society, for keeping the peace, and for the enforcement of law and order, and these they have used for wholly contrary ends. They have intimidated whole districts and sections of the country and have at times made it very difficult, through fear of personal injury afterwards inflicted, to secure convictions at the hands of honest men in their capacity as jurors, whose oath of office requires them to convict where the evidence justifies it.

I believe that the strong hand of the United States Government is essential to wipe this society from the face of the earth, and this is a step in the right direction. Of course, it is quite as necessary to prohibit the advocacy of the so-called principles of such organizations by their members as to prohibit their acting in an associated capacity and in the holding of meetings to consider better methods of carrying out and making effective their infernal propaganda.

I was told some days ago that one of the organizers of the I. W. W. appeared before the commission appointed by the President to inquire into the facts concerning the now notorious Mooney case. He was asked whether he believed in and advocated murder. He said, "Yes; because the end justified the means." He was asked whether he advocated the destruction of property, and he answered, "Yes; because the end justified the means." He was then asked, Mr. President, whether he advocated the overthrow of social conditions by any means whatever. He answered, "Yes; because the end justified the means." Yet that man was permitted to walk out a free man from the doors of that commission. He went there, as I understand, to protest that Mr. Mooney had not been convicted according to the forms of the Constitution and the law!

Mr. President, I have here a copy of a so-called hymn, furnished me by a gentleman who vouches for its genuineness, which is sung by the I. W. W. to the tune of "Onward, Christian Soldiers," and which appears in the I. W. W. songbook. It gives a graphic idea and mental picture of the infernal activities and criminal characteristics of the members of this association. I shall therefore inflict it upon the Senate:

"CHRISTIANS AT WAR."

(The following "hymn," sung by the I. W. W.'s to the tune of "Onward, Christian Soldiers," and written by John F. Kendrick, is reprinted from the I. W. W. songbook.)

Onward, Christian soldiers! Duty's way is plain;
Slay your Christian neighbors, or by them be slain.
Pulpiters are spouting effervescent swill,
God above is calling you to rob and rape and kill,
All your acts are sanctified by the Lamb on high;
If you love the Holy Ghost, go murder, pray, and die.

Onward, Christian soldiers! Rip and tear and smite!
Let the gentle Jesus bless your dynamite.
Splinter skulls with shrapnel, fertilize the sod;
Folk who do not speak your tongue deserve the curse of God.
Smash the doors of every home, pretty maidens seize;
Use your might and sacred right to treat them as you please.

Onward, Christian soldiers! Eat and drink your fill;
Rob with bloody fingers, Christ O. K.'s the bill.
Steal the farmer's savings, take their grain and meat;
Even though the children starve, the Savior's bums must eat.
Burn the peasants' cottages, orphans leave bereft;
In Jehovah's holy name, wreak ruin right and left.

Onward, Christian soldiers! Drench the land with gore;
Mercy is a weakness all the gods abhor.
Bayonet the babies, jab the mothers, too;
Hoist the cross of Calvary to hallow all you do.
File your bullets' noses flat, poison every well;
God decrees your enemies must all go plumb to hell.

Onward, Christian soldiers! Blighting all you meet,
Trampling human freedom under pious feet.
Praise the Lord whose dollar sign dupes His favored race!
Make the foreign trash respect your bullion brand of grace,
Trust in mock salvation, serve as pirates' tools;
History will say of you: "That pack of G— d— fools."

These people may call this a travesty or satire upon existing conditions. I am credibly informed that it is a part of the literature of this infamous organization.

I hope this bill will pass, Mr. President, and that it will be enforced wherever the occasion requires as summarily and completely as may be necessary to wipe out of existence this foul nest of thieves and murderers, the toleration of whose existence in this country as an association is a libel upon our character and our integrity as a law-abiding people.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I have no objection to any measure which seeks to curb these I. W. W. activities, but I am afraid that section 3 of this bill unwittingly goes a great deal further than that and may possibly accomplish a great many other things besides that, and things that were not even dreamed of by the proponents of the bill when they drew it.

I quite agree with the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and quite disagree with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that the question of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was properly answered by the Senator from Montana. Under this bill anybody who advocated or threatened lynching under any circumstances, upon any occasion, or for any purpose could be prosecuted in the Federal courts. Of course, the several States ought to be left to deal with matters of this kind.

Let me call the attention of the Senate, and particularly of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Idaho, to the reason why I think that. The third section deals with individuals. Of course, what I have said does not apply at all to these sections which deal with associations or organizations, but the third section of the bill deals with individuals and provides:

That any person who, while the United States is engaged in war, knowingly prints, publishes, edits, issues, circulates, sells, or offers for sale or distributes any book, pamphlet, picture, paper, circular, card, letter, writing, print, publication, or document of any kind in which is taught, advocated, advised, or defended—

That is complete there now—

or who shall in any manner teach, advocate, advise, or defend the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, as a means of accomplishing any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change, or otherwise, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years or by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

That is, this measure applies to any person who shall either advise or defend the use of these means or the threat of such injury either for the purpose of accomplishing any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change, or for any other purpose whatever. That broadens it to an extent that I do not believe the framers of the bill had in mind, and I hope the Senator in charge of the bill will be willing to strike out those two words "or otherwise." I think if he will do that, probably he will have accomplished all that he is seeking to accomplish without using language so general that it may be construed to cover almost everything; and that is especially true when not only the injury itself is provided against, but even the threat of the injury, which is very drastic. If we go that far and apply this bill to whoever shall advocate these things or even threaten them, I think we had better define exactly what we have in mind. I hope the Senate will agree with me. I suggest that amendment, anyhow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it was an inadvertence, I am sure, that the word "such" does not appear in the bill on line 3, page 2, after the word "any," so that it will read "shall by any such means prosecute or pursue."

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 3, before the word "means," it is proposed to insert the word "such."

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for just a minute, I want to ask the Secretary to state the amendment I suggested informally just a moment ago—to strike out the words "or otherwise" on page 3, line 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "or otherwise" and the comma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion to strike out. I think the words "or otherwise" are subject to such a construction, or at least may be the cause of such confusion, as probably to work injury. Certainly if the construction suggested by the Senator from Georgia is the correct one, that language would reach any possible offense of any kind or character. I must admit that I do not understand whether that is the correct meaning or not, but I think the use of the words "or otherwise" simply tends to confuse. I hope the Senator will agree with me and that the words "or otherwise" may be stricken out.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I feel disposed to accept the suggestion made to eliminate those two words from the bill, my own reason being that many petty offenses and petty offenders would thus be brought within the scope of the bill that might very well be left for disposition by the local authorities. The Federal Government ought not to be charged with the responsibility of prosecuting anybody, for instance, who commits malicious mischief or who advises the commission of malicious mischief, and that would fall within the terms of this provision as it stands.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, I could give, in concrete form, my reasons for objecting to these words from my experience, or from matters which have come under my observation with reference to what is commonly known as the Ku Klux statute as it has been enforced in some of the public-land States, where parties have been tried under the United States law for purely a local offense—for an assault and battery or something of that kind. Some one who desired their prosecution had them prosecuted before a United States court for attempting to prevent people from locating upon the public domain when there was no proof that there was any such purpose upon the part of either party, either the man assaulted or the man who assaulted him, when there was no evidence that the party assaulted was even attempting or intending or even had a right to settle upon the public domain. I recall very vividly one case where, as a matter of fact, it was shown that the party had used every right he had upon the public domain and could not possibly have been precluded by any assault from his right to settle upon the public domain. Still the man who was charged with the assault was tried before a United States court, after being acquitted by the State court of assault with a deadly weapon with intent to kill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not care how far we go to reach organizations like the I. W. W., provided, of course, that before we declare the guilt of any man he shall have a trial according to the laws of the land and shall have been proven guilty.

I have had heretofore something to say on the floor of the Senate about strikes, especially where the strikes are in industries which are furnishing war material.

Mr. WALSH. Did the Senator address me?

Mr. REED. Not for the moment. I intend to address an interrogatory to the Senator.

I think I have gone quite as far as any other Member of the Senate in saying that I believe a strike brought on in an industry that is making ammunition or armament is almost as bad a thing to do as a direct interference with soldiers upon the line of battle.

Yet, Mr. President, I want to ask the author of the bill if he intends to draw within it every labor organization or every labor society that may advocate a strike, provided some of its members may advocate the use of force or a threat of force?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should be very sorry, indeed, if anyone should get the impression even that there was any purpose in this bill to prohibit what is known as a peaceful strike; that is to say, an organized abandonment of work. I am a friend of organized labor and have been for many years. I believe that organizations of men engaged as wage-workers are absolutely essential in our present situation of affairs for the purpose of securing not only the industrial but the political freedom of the wage-workers.

But, Mr. President, the legitimate organizations of this country do not undertake to accomplish their ends by the use of force or violence or by the destruction of property or injury to persons, nor by threats of such. They proclaim and have pro-

claimed again and again that they do not have any such purpose and do not exist for any such purpose.

If any injudicious member of such an organization goes out and advocates the use of force or violence or injury to person or property to accomplish their end, he falls within the condemnation of this act. He is the greatest enemy there is of organized labor. He is the peril of every strike that is conducted upon legitimate lines.

I can not believe, Mr. President, that any labor organization will seek protection for a man who advocates that method of securing such an end as they seek to obtain.

Mr. REED. I desire to state with all emphasis that disloyal organizations like the I. W. W., which are going about at a time like this seeking to stir up dissension in the land and which commits acts of sabotage and other criminal offenses, get no sympathy from me. Upon the other hand, I am willing to go almost to any extent to work their extermination.

But I want to call the attention of the Senator to just what is within the four corners of this bill as I see it. My examination has been a little hasty, having just been made here on the floor of the Senate. While I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, I did not happen to be there the day this particular bill came up.

I am seeking to elicit the earnest attention of the Senator who is the author of the bill in order, if possible, to convince him there is some necessity of amendment. Observe now as I scan the bill: That any organization, "one of whose purposes or professed purposes is to bring about any social or economic change within the United States by the use of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or by threat of such injury, or which teaches, advocates, advises, or defends the use of force that is within the terms of the bill."

"Any organization which seeks to bring about any social or economic change by the use of force." What kind of force? It does not mean physical force, because that is afterwards specifically enumerated. It says any kind of force.

I raise the question, therefore, whether under this bill an organization that proposed merely to boycott a man in order to bring about an economic change, to wit, a change in wages or a change in prices or a change in the economic life of a community, would be guilty of the employment of force within the meaning of this statute, for it does not mean physical force, because the word "force" is followed by the words "violence or physical injury."

Now, let us go a step further in the analysis of the bill. It is proposed that any person who shall contribute any dues to any such organization shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 and imprisonment for not more than 10 years in the penitentiary. It is true, as the Senator has stated, that the best protestations of labor organizations always are that they do not propose to employ physical violence or to destroy property, yet they have employed force in the nature of boycott for many years. A boycott certainly involves the employment of force.

But I waive that for the moment. Here is a local labor organization. It gets into a strike, and it finally comes to a point where fisticuffs are employed.

Mr. HARDWICK. Where picketing is indulged in.

Mr. REED. I prefer the illustration where fisticuffs are employed. Here is a man who has paid his dues to that organization. He may even be protesting against that method, yet I would be very much afraid he might be drawn in under the terms of the bill.

I do not make this observation in an antagonistic spirit; I make it by way of the most kindly suggestion.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I feel very thankful to the Senator for the suggestion he has made. Of course, if the word "force" could be given any significance in the statute except physical force there would be some basis for the contention. In other words, I believe we sometimes talk about moral force, and if the force here would be considered as moral force the statute would, of course, be objectionable. But I do not think it is possible to give that construction to the statute.

Let me remark in the first place, Mr. President, that neither boycotting nor picketing contemplates the use of force. Not only that, if it did contemplate the use of force it would be subject to an injunction, and it never is.

You do not use any force when you boycott a man. Everybody agrees they will not, with that method. Where does the force come in? There is not any such thing as force in boycotting. Indeed that was the purpose, in the first place, when it was originally utilized in Ireland. The use of force would have subjected the Irishman who was objecting to conditions prevalent in his country at that time to arrest and conviction. So he devised a method of securing the end by means that did

not apply to force. Boycott was the name of a very objectionable landlord or agent of some landlord, and there was a general agreement that they would not trade with him, they would not talk to him, they would not recognize his family socially; he was simply isolated. That is the origin of the word "boycott." It is the antithesis of force.

So, Mr. President, with reference to picketing, what is picketing? I shall submit in the Record a little later extracts from the authorized publications of the I. W. W. They advocate for the purpose of securing their ends the establishment of pickets who shall prevent men from coming in the neighborhood of the works that are picketed.

That contemplates clearly the use of force to accomplish their end, but picketing as ordinarily employed in a strike does not contemplate force at all. The purpose of pickets is that a record may be kept of everyone who goes to work, and if he is a nonunion man he will be recognized and a report is made, and they will govern themselves accordingly.

Those of us who have had something to do with strike litigation recognize these distinctions very clearly, and it is recognized in the law. It is recognized in the Clayton Act. The Clayton Act does not attempt to justify the use of force either in connection with picketing or in connection with a boycott, but it clearly authorizes the use of both those means for the purpose of conducting a successful strike.

That is my answer to the Senator.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield to me just a moment for a suggestion? The Senator from Montana says that he has the declaration of the constitution and by-laws of the I. W. W. which he proposes to put in the Record. For the purpose of the argument at this time in this discussion, in connection with the line the Senator from Missouri is now taking in the discussion of the word "force" and what it means, if the Senator will allow me to do so I will read into the Record or have read from the desk from the general articles, by-laws, and constitution, and so forth, of the I. W. W. their tactics or methods as they have adopted them officially, which I think will throw a good deal of light on the discussion which has now taken place. If the Senator will allow me to introduce it now in his time, as I do not care to discuss this question at all, I will simply read it.

Mr. REED. I have no objection to reading it, although the demonstration that the I. W. W. are a bad lot is quite unnecessary to me.

Mr. FALL. I understand that, but they define "force."

Mr. REED. But they can not define force for the courts.

Mr. FALL. My impression is that this bill was drawn by someone who understood very well the tactics the I. W. W. propose.

Mr. REED. I have no doubt of it and I have no doubt it hits the I. W. W. I want them hit.

Mr. FALL. I understand the Senator does.

Mr. REED. I want them struck as hard a blow as possible, but I do not want, in trying to get at that miserable and infamous organization, to strike organizations we are not looking for at all.

Mr. FALL. I understand.

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator to read it.

Mr. FALL. With the Senator's permission, I read as follows:

I. W. W. TACTICS OR METHODS.

As a revolutionary organization, the Industrial Workers of the World aim to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of "right" and "wrong" does not concern us.

No terms made with an employer are final. All peace, so long as the wage system lasts, is but an armed truce. At any favorable opportunity the struggle for more control of industry is renewed.

The Industrial Workers realize that the day of successful long strikes is past. Under all ordinary circumstances a strike that is not won in four to six weeks can not be won by remaining out longer. In trusted industry the employer can better afford to fight one strike that lasts six months than he can six strikes that take place in that period.

The organization does not allow any party to enter into time contracts with the employers. It aims where strikes are used to paralyze all branches of the industry involved when the employers can least afford a cessation of work—during the busy season and when there are rush orders to be filled.

The Industrial Workers of the World maintain that nothing will be conceded by the employers except that which we have the power to take and hold by the strength of our organization. Therefore we seek no agreements with the employers.

Failing to force concessions from the employers by the strike, work is resumed and "sabotage" is used to force the employers to concede the demands of the workers.

The great progress made in machine production results in an ever-increasing army of unemployed. To counteract this the Industrial Workers of the World aim to establish the shorter workday and to slow up the working pace, thus compelling the employment of more and more workers.

To facilitate the work of organization, large initiation fees and dues are prohibited by the Industrial Workers of the World as an organization.

During strikes the works are closely picketed and every effort made to keep the employers from getting workers into the shops. All supplies are cut off from strike-bound shops. All shipments are refused or mis-sent, delayed, and lost, if possible. Strike breakers are also isolated to the full extent of the power of the organization. Interference by the Government is resented by open violation of the Government's orders, going to jail en masse, causing expense to the taxpayers, which is but another name for the employing class.

In short, the Industrial Workers of the World advocate the use of militant "direct-action" tactics to the full extent of our power to make good.

This is from their official document, offered and accepted in evidence in the United States court at Los Angeles, Cal., in the trial of certain parties who were accused of violating the neutrality laws of the United States, and whom the evidence showed were being supported, both financially and otherwise, by the I. W. W. organization.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I intend to take but a very few minutes. I would think I had not done my duty if I did not call attention to the language of this proposed act. I presume we shall repeat the old experience—that is, because some outrageous thing has been attempted or some outrageous organization has come into existence, we at once proceed to pass laws so broad and sweeping that scores of objects we do not want to penalize will nevertheless be declared felonies.

Mr. President, I can not agree with my distinguished friend, the author of this bill, in regard to the construction of the word "force."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I can give the Senator from Missouri a little further enlightenment upon that. I have sent for the volume of Words and Phrases containing the word "force," and I find, in the case of "burglary":

The "force" required to constitute burglary under Pennsylvania Code, article 842, may be by lifting the latch of a closed door, by raising a window, by entry at a chimney, or other unusual place, the introduction of a hand or any instrument to draw out the property through the opening made by the burglar for that purpose.

Of course, it would not be moral force.

"Force," as applied to a forced marriage, implies physical constraint of the will.

Mr. REED. Well, I will now call the Senator's attention to some definitions. I happened by mere accident—

Mr. WALSH. Pardon me one moment. In construing the forcible-entry statute it is said:

The word "force" carries with it necessarily the idea of violence exercised, and it may include a putting in fear by threats, but it can not include a mere entry by the ordinary means of entrance without any breaking and without any threat of violence to the person.

Mr. REED. The employment of the phrase is sufficient. I do not think there is much question about the fact that "force" does not necessarily have to be physical force, physical violence. For instance, we will take the question of the boycott. I happen to have on my desk Black's Law Dictionary; I read the definition of boycott.

Boycott. In criminal law. A conspiracy formed and intended, directly or indirectly, to prevent the carrying on of any lawful business or to injure the business of anyone by wrongfully preventing those who would be customers from buying anything from or employing the representatives of said business by threat, intimidation, or other forcible means.

I think that the word "force" would cover a boycott. A man, we will say, is running a grocery store and he is informed by an organization, the membership of which largely patronizes that store, that if he does not do a certain thing he will be boycotted. That means that nobody will trade with him; it may mean that nobody will speak to him; it may mean that as he passes along the street he will be subject to the silent contempt, or even the manifested contempt, of the community. It is one of the most terrible instrumentalities that can be employed. I observe that that method is referred to by Black. The phrase "threats, intimidation, or other forcible means," that being a part of the boycott.

Again—and the remarks which I am now making are without preparation—the word "force" as defined by Black is:

Power, dynamically considered, that is in motion or in action; constraining power; compulsion; strength directed to an end. Usually the word occurs in such connections as to show that unlawful or wrongful action is meant.

Unlawful violence—

That is also force—

In Scotch law. Coercion or duress—

Are treated under the head of "force."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri pardon a further interruption?

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

Mr. WALSH. I have sent for Cogley on Strikes and Lock-outs, and I find here a definition of "boycotting" and "picketing" that I should like to give to the Senator for such aid as it may afford.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. WALSH. Here is the definition:

PICKETING.

Employees early learned that a strike would be futile if they could not by some means prevent others filling the places they had voluntarily surrendered. Picketing, therefore, was one of the means adopted for that purpose. The system appears in the earliest cases on strikes. According to the modern doctrine, "picketing" by members of a trade-union on strike, consists in posting members at all the approaches to the works struck against for the purpose of observing and reporting the workmen going to or coming from the works and of using such influence as may be in their power to prevent the workmen from accepting work there.

Then it says:

Ordinarily picketing is a part of boycotting. Some of the cases, with good reason, held that picketing was itself intimidation. But Parliament in England and the legislatures of some of the States of this country have so far yielded to the encroachments of mobs as to legalize acts and conduct that at first were crimes. It may now be stated as to the rule both in England and the United States that if picketing is peacefully conducted and the acts of the pickets confined to watching, observation, and persuasion, it is not a criminal offense. But if violence to person or property is resorted to or workmen are so persistently followed as to inspire fear, or if their tools are hid so they can not work, or their houses or places of business are watched or beset, or the approaches thereto, then the acts of the pickets become unlawful.

So you will see that picketing does not imply the use of force or violence at all.

Mr. REED. It does not necessarily imply it.

Mr. WALSH. It does not necessarily imply it; certainly not. But just as soon as you apply force or violence, then this proposed statute would step in.

Mr. REED. Ah, but the decision on that authority goes no further, as I gather it from hearing it read, than to say that the court and Parliament have finally yielded to the idea that mob law may proceed that far; that being practically the phrase of the book.

Mr. WALSH. The expression—

Mr. REED. But when we come to define the word "force" here, while I think that the authority read would be of persuasive influence, I should not regard it as conclusive. I should be glad to hear the other authorities referred to by the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. The remark I was going to make was that the authority holds that peaceful picketing is not a crime and does not imply force or violence; but when force or violence are used in connection with it, it then becomes criminal. I read further:

BOYCOTTS.

A boycott is one of the most serious forms of intimidation resorted to during strikes. It may be and frequently is accompanied by violence to person or property, or it may be a complete social or business ostracism, or both, of the parties boycotted.

Anderson's Law Dictionary defines boycotting as "a combination between persons to suspend or discontinue dealings or patronage with another person or persons because of refusal to comply with a request of him or them."

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HOLLIS. It seems to me very clear that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] wish to reach the same offense. It is merely a matter of accurate definition. Now, would it not satisfy the Senator from Montana to strike out the word "force" and to leave the word "violence"? There can be no doubt about the meaning of "violence"; and if the Senator wishes to reach only questions of violence that will do it. Then the question which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] very properly raised will be cut out of consideration.

Mr. WALSH. I may be able to make a suggestion that will reach the case. I would not like to make the substitution proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire, because "violence" there contemplates the application of force in intensity; but I have not the slightest objection in the world to inserting the word "physical" before the word "force," so that it shall read "physical force."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, that will reach that point. Now, I call the Senator's attention to this language. It is proposed to make it a criminal offense, punishable by a heavy fine and long imprisonment, for anyone to contribute dues to any such unlawful organization; that is, such an organization as has been defined in the first section. I think that some phrase ought to be introduced so that the person contributing the dues must have understood the purpose of the organization.

I have this in mind: Here is a man who belongs to a labor lodge; a strike is started and finally the lodge itself resolves upon the employment of such a degree of force as would bring it within the terms of this proposed statute. Members contribute dues; there is no statement here that they shall do it knowingly; that is, that they shall do it knowing the purpose of the organization. So I think the language is too loose and general at that point.

I call the Senator's attention to that. Then I call attention to another fact. We are liable to reach, under this bill, a class of organizations which are organized for the employment of force, but which it has never been intended to put within the control of the Federal Government. There are States in this country where there are organizations to promote social purity and good morals by the occasional application of force. There are societies organized for the purpose of capturing horse thieves, and similar societies that have taken immoral women and immoral men out and chastised them and given them time to leave the community. I do not justify that way of treating crime; but it seems to me that there is no intention on the part of the author of this legislation to incorporate that class of organizations within the purview of this bill and to make them amenable to the Federal statute.

I wish to suggest to the very distinguished author of this bill, since this discussion has taken place, that if he will take the bill and go over it now he will perhaps want to make a few changes in it. That could be done, and the bill be brought up again to-morrow morning. I do not want to delay its passage. If, however, he does not want to do that; I shall not any further resist the passage of the bill; indeed, I do not want to be understood now as resisting its passage. I am only seeking to bring about its amendment.

Mr. BECKHAM. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the bill beyond to-day, for I heartily approve its purposes and shall very cheerfully vote for it. I believe it ought to be passed and enacted into law as soon as possible.

I have but one objection to it, and I am going to offer an amendment to meet that objection. If this bill is a good thing in time of war, I can see no reason why it would not be good in time of peace. If the organization which has been referred to here, or any other organization with similar purposes—

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BECKHAM. I will not yield just now—if any such organization is prohibited in time of war from accomplishing what are defined in this bill as unlawful purposes, it certainly should not be allowed to do so in time of peace. I therefore move to strike out in line—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will inform the Senator from Kentucky that his amendment at this time is not in order. There is an amendment pending, the pending amendment being that offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. SHEPPARD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What became of the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] with reference to the insertion of the word "such"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been disposed of; it was not formally tendered. Before the Senate was permitted to act upon the amendment of the Senator from Montana he yielded to the Senator from Georgia, and the parliamentary status is that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is now pending.

Mr. HARDWICK. I did not want to displace the amendment of the Senator from Montana. I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana ought to be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Montana will be considered before the Senate. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 3, before the word "means," it is proposed to insert the word "such."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, the question I wished to ask the Senator from Kentucky is this: What power would the Federal Government have to do this in time of peace? This proposed act rests on the war power; and Congress has not, in my judgment, any right to make acts of this sort in the several States crimes in times of peace.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Kentucky that that was the view taken by the Judiciary Committee, that the only power the Federal Government has in the premises is under the war power.

Mr. BECKHAM. That may be the view of the committee, but I wish to offer my amendment. Do I understand, Mr.

President, that another amendment is now pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is now before the Senate; so that the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky is not now in order.

Mr. BECKHAM. Well, my amendment would be to strike out in line 2, page 2, the words "during any war in which the United States is engaged"; in line 7, section 2, to strike out "while the United States is engaged in war"; in line 17, page 2, to strike out the words "while the United States is engaged in war"; and on page 3, line 8, to strike out the words "during any war in which the United States may be engaged." I do not believe that the inclusion in the bill of these words which I propose to strike out is necessary to make it constitutional.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "or otherwise" and the comma.

Mr. REED. One moment. I was engaged in conversation. I may be in error. I thought the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky was being voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Georgia is the amendment that has just been voted on.

Mr. REED. Very well, I withdraw my demand for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is agreed to. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to strike out the words "during any war in which the United States is engaged" and the comma.

On lines 7 and 8 of the same page it is proposed to strike out the words "while the United States is engaged in war" and the comma.

On lines 17 and 18 of page 2 it is proposed to strike out the words "while the United States is engaged in war" and the comma.

Also, on page 3, lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to strike out the words "during any war in which the United States may be engaged" and the comma.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I want to suggest to the Senator from Kentucky that if this amendment should be adopted it might render the whole bill unconstitutional. I can not discuss the amendment at this time; but I think in all probability it would be held unconstitutional, for the reason that we have no power to pass such a law except the war power.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I share the apprehension expressed by the Senator from Idaho. I feel very fearful that the whole act would fall if that amendment should prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the Senator from Montana, I think I will offer an amendment to insert the word "physical" before the word "force" in four places—on page 1, line 7; on page 1, line 10; on page 2, line 24; and on page 3, line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that I am in favor of the amendment. It merely expresses the view that was entertained concerning the significance of the bill by everyone who had anything to do with the preparation of it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I did not quite catch what the amendment is. Is it to strike out the word "force"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. Before the word "force," where it occurs in the bill four times—on page 1, line 7; on page 1, line 10; on page 2, line 24; and on page 3, line 11—it is proposed to insert the word "physical," so that it will read "of physical force, violence, or physical injury to person or property."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I do not care to take time to debate this matter, but I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, on page 2, lines 1 and 2, I move to strike out the words "or for any other purpose."

Before the Secretary states the amendment I want to say that I think that is practically the same proposition that was involved in the other general language. The first section of the bill reads in this way:

That any association, organization, society, or corporation, one of whose purposes or professed purposes is to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change within the United States by the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or by threats of such injury, or which teaches, advocates, advises, or defends the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, to accomplish such change or for any other purpose—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there is a little difference there, and I trust the Senator will not press the amendment. This section refers only to associations; and if an association exists and teaches, for the purpose of accomplishing any end, the use of force or violence or the destruction of property, I think we may very well endeavor to suppress the organization during the war.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite admit that there is that difference, although I think the same proposition is involved, and I will tell the Senator why. Now, you see, you even put in the threat to use violence.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but it is only addressed to an organization.

Mr. HARDWICK. I know; but when you are dealing with the war power, and enacting legislation under it, it strikes me that you ought to confine it to things that are strictly connected with the war. I think the Senator is right as a matter of public policy, that this would be a perfectly sound proposition for any State legislature or for all State legislatures; but surely you do not want to broaden it beyond the express purposes that you have outlined in the bill, every one of which is immediately and directly connected with the adequate prosecution of the war. The trouble is that this language would broaden it so that if any organization, for any reason, used language that some people might say threatened violence to person or property, although it had no relation to the war, although it did not seek to change the policies of the country, nor did it come within any of these definitions sought by the Senator, the Senator's committee, and the Senator's bill, it would come within the provisions of the law as written. In other words, the bill would apply to language that did not seek to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change within the United States—if it was for any other reason except that.

That is the reason why I think this language ought to go out. While I hope the amendment will be adopted, I admit that it is not nearly as important as the other amendment I offered, which the Senate adopted; but I think it is going a long way to say that in the exercise of the war power you will undertake to do anything, even with organizations, where the thing penalized is not tolerably well connected with the conduct of the war.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator desires to strike out "or for any other purpose." Is that correct?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir; that was the idea I had.

Mr. McCUMBER. Can the Senator give us an instance which he may have in his mind in which it would be perfectly proper for a person to use force or violence or physical injury toward another person? Will the Senator tell us for what lawful purpose it could be used?

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Georgia does not think he has to sustain that sort of a burden in order to establish the correctness of his proposal. If it was a purpose that was purely domestic, that was not in any way connected with the efficiency of the country in the war, then, as I view questions of this sort, the Federal Government would have no power whatever to enact a rule of civil conduct on that question; or suppose it was some purely local thing, like night riding in Kentucky or Georgia, or any other State, or these local disturbances that at times we have had, during which we have heard of some threats being used. The local courts and local laws are perfectly competent to handle those things; and, as I understood it, that was not what you were striking at at all.

Mr. McCUMBER. As the purpose is always one of intent, it would be quite simple and easy for any offender to show that his intent was for some purpose other than that connected in any way with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at all. If the Senator will pardon me, the question of intent is not involved at all.

Mr. McCUMBER. Well, "purpose" must mean "intent" as used in this provision.

Mr. HARDWICK. But let me explain to the Senator why I think the question of intent is not really at stake here. "Purpose" is not used as an equivalent of "intent" in this draft:

Which teaches, advocates, advises, or defends the use, without authority of law, of force, violence, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury—

Now, for what purpose? For what object? I will use that word to show the Senator what I mean—to accomplish such change—

That is, the change referred to in the previous part of the section—governmental, social, industrial, or economic changes within the United States. Now, how could you say "any other purpose" when you have already specified exactly what you mean? I can not see why those words should be used.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understood that one of the reasons was so that a person who committed an unlawful act, which under any construction would be against all moral law as well as the established doctrine, could not excuse himself by saying that he intended some other purpose.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I should agree with him perfectly if we were in a State legislature enacting a rule of civil conduct; but when we exercise the war power with respect to this particular matter we ought to confine it to the objects that are really within the purview of that power. It might be that the Senator's moral proposition would be a perfectly unanswerable one in every State legislature, in all of the 48 States; but surely, even in time of war, there is a certain field for exclusive action on local questions and domestic matters left to the lawmaking bodies of the different States in the Union. That is the reason why I think it is a good amendment; and ought to be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I do not think a change so important as this ought to be voted on with only 15 Senators present, and therefore I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The SECRETARY called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Gronna	Martin	Shields
Beckham	Hardwick	New	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Henderson	Nugent	Smoot
Calder	Hollis	Page	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	Phelan	Thompson
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Tillman
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Polindexter	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Pomerene	Walsh
Dillingham	Kenyon	Reed	Warren
Fall	King	Robinson	Watson
Fletcher	Lewis	Saulsbury	Weeks
France	McCumber	Shafroth	Williams
Gallinger	McKellar	Sheppard	
Gerry	McNary	Sherman	

Mr. TRAMMELL. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is absent on account of illness.

I wish also to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] is detained on official business.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK].

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, after some conference with the Senator who reports this bill, while I believe the amendment is right and that probably it would be safer to adopt it, I am not disposed to press it now; and if no one objects, I will withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia withdraws his amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendments stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The SECRETARY. Before the word "force," where it appears in the bill in four places, the word "physical" has been inserted, so as to read "of physical force, violence, or physical injury."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to delay this matter in any way. I want it understood, however, and in the RECORD, that I object to the insertion of the word "physical."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this bill is being considered during the morning hour, and unless it is passed within a very few minutes it will go over, unless by unanimous consent or by motion its consideration may be continued. I had intended making some observations concerning this measure, its objects, and purposes, and the situation which it was designed to meet, but

not wishing to delay its passage, I will refrain from carrying out my design. In a word or two, however, I may add that there is a criminal and treasonable organization in our midst that is a menace to the peace and tranquillity of the people. This bill will not impose upon the rights of any labor organization or affect any law-abiding person. It strikes at such organizations as the I. W. W.—organizations that seek the overthrow of our Government, our social and industrial institutions, and the principles of justice which obtain among civilized peoples. I regret that the States have not dealt with these organizations and their members and passed criminal statutes to adequately punish them. This measure I would not support except as a war measure. It is the duty of the States to enact all proper police regulations and such criminal laws as may be necessary to protect life and property. However, I believe that under the war powers of the Federal Government the provisions of this bill can be supported and that the disloyal, wicked, and treasonable activities of the organization referred to and many of its members are sufficient warrant for legislation of this character. Several months ago I gave an interview concerning the I. W. W. organization which was published in a metropolitan newspaper. It expresses some of my views concerning this organization, and, because of the lack of time and opportunity upon this occasion to discuss this measure and to present some of my views concerning organizations whose teachings are destructive of law and order and our Government, I desire to submit this interview and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. Of course, this interview does not consider the legal questions in legislation of this character nor cover the various phases of a subject so vital and far reaching.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

It is gratifying to know that the overwhelming majority of the people of this country are loyal to its institutions and devoted to the great principles of liberty for which this Republic stands and with grim and earnest determination are supporting the administration in this stupendous war between the forces of democracy and liberty upon the one hand and of autocracy and tyranny upon the other hand.

There are, however, within the borders of our land a few traitors, a number of Prussianized Americans who came to this country to secure political liberty and to enjoy the material blessings of a free Republic and whose allegiance is still given to the enemy that is seeking the destruction of this Republic; a number of sentimental pacifists, whose misguided teachings are poisonous and graze the edge of treason. Then there are the members of that criminal, disloyal, and brazenly atheistic organization known as the Industrial Workers of the World. Perhaps there is no greater menace to the internal peace and domestic tranquillity of our country than this criminal association.

It is difficult, in view of our standards of civilization and the Christian ideals and ethical concepts of the American people to comprehend how such a malignant growth as this organization is could fasten itself upon our industrial system. However, we find in nature the strange paradox that extremes sometimes meet; and so in society and in government the ethereal, righteous, and progressive forces are opposed by dark and destructive elements.

Numerically the Industrial Workers of the World organization is not strong. I do not think its membership exceeds 200,000, and yet its name has become a source of terror and fear for the same reason that a mad dog in the crowded thoroughfare or a murderous maniac at large might terrorize a large community.

It is not only an organization destructive of society, but it is a treasonable organization. This is not overstating it, because it is giving aid and comfort to the enemies of this Republic. Its leaders and members defiantly announce that they will commit deeds of violence and assail the very foundations of the Government and of society. They attack in subtle and in open manner the industrial life of the Nation to bring about the result that there will be no resources for military organization or preparedness, so that this country may be prevented from giving any aid or support to the forces of the great nations with which we are united in an effort to defend liberty and defeat Prussian militarism.

The members of this organization have no interest in this Government or in any government. Indeed they disclaim any nationality. They know no flag except the flag of revolution, and no emblem except that which stands for murder and the most savage depravity. They refuse allegiance to any country, deny the authority of any governmental agency, and desire the destruction of every form of authority or government, national and municipal. They regard this nation-wide war with satisfaction and would rejoice if it culminated in the destruction of our Government and the overthrow of all authority in the world. Having no flag and no country and wishing the overthrow of this great Republic, they are doing everything within their power to prevent the Nation and the people from mobilizing their resources, developing their industries, raising armies and building navies, and taking effective steps to vigorously prosecute the war.

If German troops were upon our shores, they would furnish information that would aid in their efforts to subjugate our people. If they could communicate any information to our enemies that would aid them in their efforts against us, they would willingly impart it. Indeed, their plan is to do everything possible to hinder and prevent the prosecution of the war, to sow the seeds of internal revolution, to spread sedition, to inflame the passions of the ignorant, and to demoralize and disorganize all of the forces that make for law and order.

The members of this criminal specie find their way into the industrial circles and among all the laboring classes. Their purpose is to compel, by threats, criminal violence, or otherwise, all persons who labor to strike in order to arrest all of the forces necessary to the life of the Nation. They attempt to close every mine, shut down every factory and manufacturing plant, stop every train, prevent the planting of all crops, or the reaping of the harvest. They declare that they are a revolutionary organization, and that the question of right and wrong does not

concern them or affect their methods or their aims. They boldly declare, as a part of their creed, that the interference of the Government will be opposed by open violation of the Government's orders, and they advocate the use of militant and "direct action," by which they mean the use of force and violence, the employment of every weapon to destroy government, paralyze industry, demoralize society.

They see in this world war an opportunity, as they believe, to bring about their plan of destroying all government and capital and of seizing whatever there is corporeal or physical in this world. In pursuance of this nefarious design they destroy property by the use of dynamite and in an extraordinary way. They blow up manufacturing plants and seek particularly the destruction of those agencies employed by private individuals or the Government in providing munitions, clothing, and the multitude of articles required in the prosecution of the war.

In the West they are particularly active and have found a fruitful field for their propaganda. They have been especially active in their efforts to shut down the copper and lead producing mines of the West. They appreciate the imperative necessity of our Government, not only for its own uses but for the use of the nations with whom we are allied in this war, procuring immense quantities of copper and lead. Accordingly they invaded peaceable mining camps where high wages were paid and general prosperity existed, and by violence, intimidation, seditious utterances, and poisonous, treasonable efforts they caused thousands of miners to leave their employment, as a result of which mines have been shut down and a chaotic condition produced.

In many of the districts into which they penetrated there were found a large number of aliens. Some were Austrians, and in some of the Arizona mining camps a large number of them were Mexicans. Every means was employed to inflame the minds of these people against this Government and against all persons who owned any property, and particularly those who owned or operated mines and mills and plants and employed labor. Exaggerated statements were made as to the profits of employers, and impassioned appeals made to the employees that they should cease to operate the mines and manufacturing plants and all of the industrial activities of the country. Particular effort was made to provoke strikes in those works that were producing articles for the allies and for our Government. Many of these appeals were adroitly phrased and cunningly presented under the pretext of effecting a world-wide internationalism of the workmen. But the prime purpose was to destroy production, the social organism, and the Nation.

The agricultural districts were invaded and the torch was applied where unsuccessful efforts were made to prevent the harvesting of crops. The bridges and tunnels of our land, and particularly in the West, have to be guarded by armed soldiers against the treacheries of this criminal class who would destroy them and thus prevent the operation of the trains and halt the transportation forces of our country. They would, if they had the power, destroy all bridges, railroads, and ships.

They terrorize the honest wage earner, and do not hesitate to assassinate him if they can not secure his allegiance by other means. Life has no sacredness to them, and it does not stand in the way of the accomplishment of their designs. They openly teach murder, and they brutally and defiantly advocate the destruction of property and the overthrow of government.

Their organization, under any and all circumstances, is a menace to organized society and government, but it is particularly deadly in a crisis such as confronts our Nation to-day. In order to carry on the war successfully our fields and farms must be productive, our factories must be operated to their full capacity, and every resource of the people must be employed in the most efficient way. We must produce and produce still more. This means organization, union, cooperation, domestic tranquillity, and contented, patriotic, enthusiastic people in all the broad land. There must be complete integration of all of our activities.

The political, industrial, and social mechanisms must be coordinated and operated without friction.

"Sabotage" is a word employed by them, and they urge sabotage in all its forms as applied to our vast industrial machine. As they employ the word it means intimidation, coercion, and any means necessary to gain an end; it means the throwing into the delicate machinery of the industrial and economic organization any "foreign substance" that will destroy the machine. This "foreign substance" is generally force, physical violence, and murder.

They declare that by revolution and violence "capitalism" must be destroyed and all of the industries of the world surrendered to them. They proclaim that there is a guerrilla warfare as well as a battle; that the battle is between two opposing forces and must culminate in the destruction of human government, organized society, the ownership of property, and of our civilization. It is not higher wages or improved conditions for the laboring man for which this organization is striving. It is admitted that whatever demands are conceded by employers to-day, other shall be made to-morrow; that whatever agreements may be entered into, they should be violated; that instead of orderly development and harmonious relation between employer and employee, there should be revolution and no amity or friendly cooperation.

Some people entertain the view that the I. W. W. organization is seeking the amelioration of the condition of the laboring man, and there has been some sympathy in certain sections for members of this organization. As stated, such is not its object. The people might as well know exactly the character of this association. It is as bitterly assails the laboring man who believes in labor unions, in government, in law and order, in the Christian civilization of the day, as it does the man who employs labor.

If 50,000 men should meet together in some public square in the city of New York and there openly and cynically deny the existence of a God, of all moral restraints, of all standards of ethics or righteousness, and should proclaim opposition to the sanctity of marriage, and the building of homes, and the assumption of the obligations entailed by the rearing of a family, and to all forms of government, either municipal, State, or national, and if they should further declare that they intended to shut down every factory, close every store, prevent the operation of street cars, take possession of the city, deprive owners of their property, whether large or small, and if following these declarations they did attempt to carry them into effect and did close factories and plants and turn men out of employment and cause violence, strikes, murders, arson, and the wanton destruction of life and property; and if they further attempted to take possession of the Government; and made war upon those who were engaged in preserving peace and order, and finally they succeeded in reducing everything to welter, chaos, and ruin, then some idea might be obtained of the plans and purposes and methods of operation of this hideous, malevolent association known as the I. W. W.

So far as I can learn, the overwhelming majority of the membership are aliens. It was stated in some of the newspapers that of those recently deported from Bisbee, Ariz., one-half were Mexicans and a considerable number were Austrians, and that only a small proportion were native-born American citizens. They are nomadic, homeless, and homeless. They have no family ties, no habits of thrift or sobriety, and in every sense of the word are utterly at war with our institutions, our form of society, and our industrial and governmental life. They resent those habits of industry and thrift which are regarded as virtues among all decent and civilized communities.

A thrifty man inevitably acquires some property; the amount may be small, but it gives him a feeling of security and an interest in the Government and in the social organization of which he forms a part. He feels that he is a part of society and of the Government. In this way he becomes more stable, more conservative, and more interested in the form of local or municipal government, in the State, and in the Nation. He feels that he is a cog—although, perhaps, a small one—in the machinery of life and industry of the world. It makes for better thinking, for manhood, and for a spirit of home building. He marries, rears a family, and is interested in that family and in its happiness and welfare. He desires good government, one that is safe and progressive, one that will afford protection to the property which he acquires as well as to his person and the lives of his family.

He sees that there is an ethical principle, a standard of justice, that obtains in and applies to all human conduct, and that virtue and righteousness exalt the individual as well as the Nation. He sees that religion is a concomitant of a progressive civilization, and he learns to appreciate the fact that there is a Supreme and Omnipotent Power presiding over the destiny of men and nations. These views inspire him to better work, to greater service, for his family, his community and State. He seeks to excel in the business or trade which he follows, in order that he may be more useful, not only to himself but to his family and to the community. He sees that anarchy and chaos inevitably result from no government and when the moral restraints imposed by true religion and a high standard of ethics are not observed. All these virtues, views, and principles are sneered at and despised by the Industrial Workers of the World. To them there is no God, nothing infinite, immortal, or eternal. We are in a blind world of chance, without design and without purpose.

Order, union, law, government, wholesome restraint, religion—all of these words are meaningless to them, and the forms, influences, and powers behind them and accompanying them are the objects of their hatred and implacable fury. Of course, such a creed will attract to it the godless, the wicked, the corrupt, the criminal, and all those whose brutish instincts rebel at decency and right thinking and right living; and so most of the Industrial Workers of the World are vagabonds and tramps, the flotsam and jetsam on the tumultuous sea of life. Many go from the penitentiary to the Industrial Workers of the World organization, and many go from the Industrial Workers of the World organization to the penitentiary, and more should go there.

I might add that the evidence seems to be very strong, though more or less circumstantial, that members of this organization are in the employ of Germany. Certain it is that many of them are sunnied with an abundance of gold, and denounce this country and speak approvingly of Germany. In some sections where Austrians were employed the I. W. W.'s urged them to strike, using as an argument, among others, that they were producing materials which would be used by the allies and by this country against their countrymen; that is, the Austrians and Germans. In several instances, these appeals were effective and resulted in serious strikes and disorders. I feel sure that the Department of Justice, which has been diligent in protecting the interests of our country and our people, has a mass of evidence supporting this view; and upon the trial of some of these I. W. W.'s indubitable evidence will be produced connecting members of this organization with German intrigues.

It is singular, but we find as bitter opposition to trade-unions as to the capitalists, so called. The result, of course, must be that the members of the labor unions can not be and are not in sympathy with the I. W. W. Trade labor unionism fosters, as the I. W. W. says, industry, and the belief that there is a common interest between the employers and the employees. Trade-unionism brings stability among the laboring people and seeks to have industry, peace, and order, and proper development. The true laboring man is anxious for the perpetuity of society and the maintenance of good government and the proper growth and development in all of the activities of trade and commerce. The I. W. W. proclaims the abolition of the wage system, and declares that capitalism must be destroyed. One of their principal teachers says that the question of right and wrong "does not concern us." All opposition, so long as the wage system lasts, is but an armed truce. At any favorable opportunity the struggle for more control of industry is renewed.

"Interference by the Government is resented by open violation of the Government's orders, going to jail en masse, causing expenses to the taxpayers. . . . In short, the I. W. W. advocates the use of militant direct-action tactics to the full extent of our power to make good. . . . Sabotage is to this class struggle what the guerrilla warfare is to the battle. The strike is the open battle of the class struggle. Sabotage is the guerrilla warfare between two opposing classes. The I. W. W. is fast approaching the stage where it can accomplish its mission. This mission is revolutionary in character. We are not satisfied with a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. Such a thing is impossible. Labor is entitled to all wealth. We are going to do away with capitalization by taking possession of the land and the machinery or production. We do not intend to buy them, either. . . . Organized with the working class we will have the power. . . .

"Property—either material or in the form of specialized skill—has ceased to exist for the proletariat. . . . And following the loss of the property idea comes a complete revolution in the mental attitude of the worker. . . . His whole attitude is one of opposition: opposition to the property of the master class—an attitude utterly subversive of all modern ethics, morals, religions, and laws—an utterly revolutionary attitude. . . . Craft unionism can not survive. Any economic system built upon the rights of property is a confiscatory system."

This writer, speaking for the organization, states that the proletariat is the subject class and that the special function of the State is to keep the proletariat in subjection, therefore, he argues, "All the activities of the proletariat furthering its program for a new society must necessarily be revolutionary and be beyond the law. Therefore, the Socialist politicians' 'legal revolution' idea is regarded as absurd."

Elizabeth Curley Flynn, one of the I. W. W. agitators, urges intimidation, coercion, and any means necessary to gain the end.

It is obvious that such an organization is an outlaw. It can not exist in a country where property rights are respected; where law, order, schools, religion, industry, business, progress, and civilization are found. It is difficult to deal with this menace, but the situation to-day calls for vigorous, repressive measures. Already the Government is moving to repress the activities of its leaders and to prevent its treasonable and lawless course.

The secretary of the organization, Mr. Roan, was recently arrested, and doubtless others will soon be brought before the power of justice. I think it should be said that perhaps some of the followers of this revolutionary movement do not quite appreciate the inherent viciousness of the system and the ultimate end of its preachments. Of course, the person cast from society, one whose crimes had isolated him from society, would naturally gravitate to an organization which aimed at the destruction of society. A man without conscience—the cold-blooded murderer—would seek comrades among an organization teaching such abhorrent doctrines.

A few years ago a number of the members of this association came to the State of Utah. One of their number, named Hillstrom, with one of his associates committed a foul murder. After a fair trial he was convicted and executed. The courageous governor of the State, William Spry, refused commutation of his sentence, and members of the organization attempted to assassinate the governor. The executed criminal became an idol of these outlaws and a number of them followed his ashes as they were carried through the streets of Chicago and glorified his death and the wicked cause with which he was identified.

A number of measures supplementing existing law are now pending in Congress that perhaps may aid in dealing with some of the activities of this criminal body.

I hope a broad and comprehensive law will be enacted that will more effectively aid the Government in its efforts to protect industry and labor and to punish and overthrow, if possible, an organization the objects of which are so grave a menace to the foundations of society and Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on concurring in the amendment made as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment was concurred in.

The SECRETARY. On page 2, line 3, before the word "means," the word "such" was inserted.

The amendment was concurred in.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 2, the words "or otherwise" and the comma were stricken from the bill.

The amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to declare unlawful associations purposing by physical force, violence, or injury to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change in the United States, and prescribing punishment for persons engaged in the activities of such associations, and for other purposes."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I deem it rather unwise to condemn any association in advance under this bill; but I submit for the Record excerpts which I have had prepared from literature issued by the Industrial Workers of the World, indicating the purpose of that organization to use force and violence to accomplish its ends.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same will be printed, without objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

I. HISTORY.

Digested from The I. W. W.: Its History, Structure, and Methods. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio, 1913.

In the fall of 1904 six active workers in the revolutionary labor movement held a conference. There they decided to issue a call for a larger gathering. Invitations were sent out to 36 additional individuals who were active in the radical labor organizations and the socialist political movement of the United States, inviting them to meet in secret conference in Chicago, Ill., January 2, 1905. The conference met at the appointed time, with 30 present, and drew up the Industrial Union manifesto calling for a convention to be held in Chicago June 27, 1905, for the purpose of launching an organization in accord with the principles set forth in the manifesto. On the date set the convention assembled, with 186 delegates present from 34 State, district, national, and local organizations, representing about 90,000 members. The convention lasted 12 days, adopted a constitution, and elected officers.

II. OFFICIAL PROGRAM.

Quoted from I. W. W. Preamble. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio:

"The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found among millions of working people and the few, who make up the employing class, have all the good things of life."

"Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the workers of the world organize as a class, take possession of the earth and the machinery of production, and abolish the wage system."

"We find that the centering of the management of industries into fewer and fewer hands makes the trade-unions unable to cope with the ever-growing power of the employing class. The trade-unions foster a state of affairs which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another set of workers in the same industry, thereby helping to defeat one another in wage wars. Moreover, the trade-unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers."

"These conditions can be changed and the interest of the working class upheld only by an organization formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry, or in all industries, if necessary, cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof, thus making an injury to one an injury to all."

"Instead of the conservative motto, 'A fair day's wages for a fair day's work,' we must inscribe on our banner the revolutionary watchword, 'Abolition of the wage system.'"

"It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism. The army of production must be organized not only for the everyday struggle with the capitalists but also to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. By organizing industrially we are forming the structure of the new society within the shell of the old."

Quoted from *The I. W. W.: Its History, Structure, and Methods*. I. W. W. Publishing Co., page 11:

"In its basic principle the I. W. W. calls forth that spirit of revolt and resistance that is so necessary a part of the equipment of any organization of the workers in their struggle for economic independence. In a word, its basic principle makes the I. W. W. a fighting organization. It commits the union to an unceasing struggle against the private ownership and control of industry."

"There is but one bargain that the I. W. W. will make with the employing class—complete surrender of all control of industry to the organized workers."

Quoted from *How to Overcome the High Cost of Living*. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, pages 14-15:

"The progressive program of the I. W. W., by which it will build the framework of the new society within the shell of the old, while at the same time getting ready to take possession of all the industries, will be put into effect as fast as possible, whenever and wherever the workers generate the power so to do."

"The workers take a shorter workday. They work slowly; this makes it necessary to employ more workers, thereby decreasing the number of unemployed; the workers then force the employers to pay higher wages. This strengthens the workers and weakens the capitalists; there will be more paid and less unpaid labor; the workers control more of the wealth their applied labor power produces. Industry becomes more centralized, forcing the little labor skimmers into the ranks of the workers. The workers, because of their increased wages, are enabled to consume better food, clothing, and shelter. The workers continually reduce the workday, curtail production, decrease the army of the unemployed, increase wages. The stronger the workers become the weaker grow the capitalists. The workers elect their own foremen, superintendents, and managers; they dominate the direction and control of industry; the workers impose their will upon society. Industry is more and more centralized; the capitalists have no retainers left to think and fight for them. The workers, ever stronger, more dominant, shorten the workday, curtail production to the point where unpaid labor disappears—this abolishes the wage system, production for profit ceases. Production for use is now the order; all physically and mentally capable members of society become useful workers. Economic classes are abolished. Industrial administration and industrial democracy, based on free association of workers, comes into being. Every member of human society has security in the means of life, with full and equal opportunity to develop the best that is in each for the benefit of all."

III. TACTICS OR METHODS.

Quoted from *The I. W. W. History: Structure and Methods*. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, Cleveland, Ohio, 1913, pages 17-18:

"As a revolutionary organization the Industrial Workers of the World aims to use any and all tactics that will get the results sought with the least expenditure of time and energy. The tactics used are determined solely by the power of the organization to make good in their use. The question of 'right' and 'wrong' does not concern us."

"No terms made with an employer are final. All peace so long as the wage system lasts is but an armed truce. At any favorable opportunity the struggle for more control of industry is renewed."

"No part of the organization is allowed to enter into time contracts with the employers. Where strikes are used, it aims to paralyze all branches of the industry involved, when the employers can least afford a cessation of work—during the busy season and when there are rush orders to be filled."

"The Industrial Workers of the World maintains that nothing will be conceded by the employers except that which we have the power to take and hold by the strength of our organization. Therefore we seek no agreements with the employers."

"Failing to force concessions from the employers by the strike, work is resumed and 'sabotage' is used to force the employers to concede the demands of the workers."

"The great progress made in machine production results in an ever-increasing army of unemployed. To counteract this the Industrial Workers of the World aims to establish the shorter workday and to slow up the working pace, thus compelling the employment of more and more workers."

"During strikes the works are closely picketed and every effort made to keep the employers from getting workers into the shops. All supplies are cut off from the strike-bound shop. All shipments are refused or misdirected, delayed, and lost, if possible. Strike breakers are also isolated to the full extent of the power of the organization. Interference by the Government is resented by open violation of the Government's orders, going to jail en masse, causing expense to the taxpayers, which is but another name for the employing class."

"In short, the I. W. W. advocates the use of militant 'direct-action' tactics to the full extent of our power to make good."

Quoted from *How to Overcome the High Cost of Living*. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau, page 13:

"The Industrial Workers of the World, the revolutionary working class industrial union, is a strictly nonpolitical organization, declaring that the workers must organize their industrial power and use it directly at the point of production, sign no contracts with employers, but take advantage of every opportunity to shorten the workday, curtail production, and increase wages. Do away as much as possible with the outside strike where workers leave the boss in possession of the job and give him the opportunity to put scabs at work. Striking on the job and compelling the boss to pay strike benefits is better than long-drawn-out starvation strikes. The only time the workers should leave the job is when the employer locks them out, and the revolutionary workers will develop the means to checkmate that. Direct action, sabotage, passive resistance, and irritation strikes are some of the tactics of the revolutionary Industrial Workers of the World."

Quoted from *Eight-Hour Workday: What It Will Mean and How to Get It*. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau:

"How are we to gain the eight-hour day? is another question. 'By simply taking it!'"

"The first thing to do is to educate your fellow workers in the shop. * * * Second, agitate * * *. Then comes organization * * * and when you see that your industrial union is strong enough, take the eight-hour day. Go to work in the shop, and when your eight hours are up go home; come back the next day and do the same thing. 'The boss will not like it at first; he may lock you out; he may try to send away for scabs to take your place. If you think you are going to get locked, go back as though willing to submit. A little later on, when the boss least expects it, repeat the dose, and when he sees that you mean business he will give in.'"

Quoted from *Union Scabs and Others*. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau:

"When a strike is declared it becomes the chief duty of the organization to effect a complete shutdown of the plant. For that purpose warnings are mailed, or wired, to other places, to prevent workmen from moving on the afflicted city."

"Pickets are stationed around the plant, or factory, or harbor, to stop workers from taking the places of the strikers. Amateur scabs are coaxed, persuaded, or bullied away from the seat of the strike. Persuasion having no effect on the professional strike breaker, he is sometimes treated to a brickbat shower. Shut down the plant; shut it down completely is the watchword of the strike."

Quoted from *Getting Recognition*. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau:

"The way to get recognition from the employers is the same as the way to get any other concessions from them—compel it. Take it by the strong hand. * * *

"The way to get recognition for the union is to get a union that the bosses can not help recognizing. * * * one that ties up the whole plant when there is a strike."

Quoted from *Appeal to Wageworkers, Men and Women*. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau:

"All members of the I. W. W. must at all times act in concert. For example, in case of strike in one factory, every worker must go out, and leave the factory deserted entirely. And all workers in all industries throughout the jurisdiction of the I. W. W. must act as one against the factory."

"2. All workers of all industrial unions and departments may be called out on strike if need be."

"3. The hours may be decreased without strike. For example, work eight hours and no longer, and ignore the wishes of the boss."

"4. 'Passive strike'; that is, to obey the rules to the letter, and thereby force the employer to come to terms. This method has proven successful on railroad systems in Austria and Italy."

"5. Intermittent strike; that is, go on strike one day, go back to work the next, and so on, if deemed necessary to win the point in question."

"6. Opportune strike; that is, go on strike when the capitalist has orders that must be filled immediately or when similar conditions give promise of victory."

"7. If demands are not granted, turn out poor work, or work slow, so that to decrease profits until the employer will be made to understand that he will gain most by granting the demands."

"8. In case of a capitalist injunction against strikes, violate it, disobey it; let the strikers and others go to jail if necessary. That would cost so much that the injunction would be dispensed with."

"9. Final universal strike; that is, to remain within the industrial institutions, lock the employers out for good as owners and parasites, and give them a chance to become useful toilers."

Editorial quoted from *Industrial Worker*, May 5, 1917:

"To the master class the I. W. W. makes no apologies and gives no excuse. Workers organized in the I. W. W. say to the master: 'We have the power to gain certain concessions, and we are going to take them because we have the power. When we have attained more power we will take more of the good things of life till all labor has produced is the property of labor.'"

Editorial quoted from *Industrial Worker*, September 1, 1917:

"The I. W. W. recognizes that the workers suffer from industrial evils, an industrial autocracy. * * * Direct action as used by the I. W. W. means that the I. W. W. stands for the cure of the evils on the job through direct industrial action on the job."

Editorial quoted from *Industrial Worker*, Seattle, Wash., November 3, 1917:

"The character of the I. W. W. is so international that any attack upon it is bound to have an effect elsewhere in the world of capitalism. The syndicalists of the European countries are bound to the industrial unionists of this country with ties that not even the greatest war in history can break. Industrial labor will answer American terrorism!"

Quoted from *Solidarity*, Chicago, Ill., March 24, 1917, page 2:

"Preparedness."

"The question of 'preparedness' is also being considered—what preparations have been made or are necessary to pursue a war to a successful conclusion? To the profit gluttons of big business it means battleships, cannons, shrapnel, and machine guns and other things which are essential to the slaughtering of slaves. But to the worker—to you—preparedness means something entirely different. It means things that are necessary in order to successfully battle with the speed-up system on one hand and the high cost of living on the other. And it means more than this. Have you ever asked yourself what 'preparedness' means to you?"

"Are you prepared to fight the every-day battle with the boss for shorter hours, more wages, and better conditions with a fair chance of winning?"

"Are you prepared to defend your class, as well as yourself, from the rapacity of the murderous thieves of big business?"

"Are you prepared to defend your fellow workers now held as prisoners of war in the clutches of the enemy?"

"Are you prepared to defend your press—the press of the I. W. W.—and the right of the workers to free speech, no matter what happens? Don't forget that the powers that be would like to do away with the papers that show up the real facts of the class war, so that the dastardly work of jailing and hanging fighting members of the working class in different parts of the country can go on unprotected and unmolested while the prostitutes of the capitalist press divert the minds of all with a sickening mess of pale fripperies, black lies, and jingoism."

"And to you who are not members of the one big union as yet will the union you now belong to permit you to strike any time occasion demands? or to participate in a general strike, if necessary, to meet a sudden contingency of the unknown future? We are living in critical times; are you tied down by contracts or divided by crafts, or are you dominated by a bunch of grafting officials and tied hand and foot by what they say and do?"

"Are you prepared with forcible weapons to successfully fight your battles on the industrial field? Do you know what sabotage means and how and when to apply it in order to block the desires of the modern shysters from taking more than the 'pound of flesh' that each slave is forced to yield up these days in exchange for bread?"

"Do you know what direct action means? Are you afraid to use it against the parasites who would speed you up to a killing pace, and who, when they have squeezed you dry, would throw you onto the industrial scrap heap, or who would take you from your work and your family and drain the last drop of your blood on their stupid battle fields? And then do the same thing to your children when you are no more? Do you still respect the robbers who gouge you every day of your life? Do you respect the chains they rivet on your wrists or the laws that sanction the hideous game of exploitation? Are you ready to use direct action to better your condition and to free yourself from wage slavery?"

"Do you know what the general strike would mean to you and your class? Are you prepared to take your place and do your bit to help frustrate the gigantic conspiracies now being hatched by the enemies of labor? Do you know what organization—real labor organization means? How much do you know about that union known as the Industrial Workers of the World?"

"The I. W. W. is organizing all the workers of all industries into one big union. The I. W. W. is showing the workers how to use all the weapons that modern industrial development has placed in the hands of the producing class. And the I. W. W. is the only organization that is out not only to win the everyday battles with the boss chap, but to do away with exploitation, ignorance, and slavery by abolishing the wage system and establishing industrial freedom, where each worker will receive the full product of his labor, where there will be no place for the social parasite, and where health and happiness will be the lot of every human being. Preparedness means organization and industrial unionism. The I. W. W. is the only form of organization that meets the requirements of the ever changing industrial development of to-day. Before long a man who isn't a union man in the full sense of the word will be considered a scab."

"If you are seeking preparedness, join the I. W. W. You will never have a better chance than now. Take your place with your fellow workers in the trenches of the industrial war—your war—and show that you are made of the stuff that men are made of."

IV. ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR.

(a) Military service.

Quoted from War and the Workers. I. W. W. Publishing Bureau:

"Young man, when you are asked to enlist in the Army or Navy, to be used as food for cannon, be sure you look before you leap."

"Remember the Spanish-American War, with its vile and unspeakable record of embalmed beef, shoddy uniforms, bum-fitting brogans, leaky tents, rotten ships, and a rotten bureaucracy, blow-hole armor plate a la Carnegie, insufficient and inedible food, venereal diseases, and malarial fever."

"Remember that the Sugar and Tobacco Trusts got the goods and the workers got the malarial fever."

"Remember that the officers got the honor and the glory, and the men got shot at."

"Remember that the officers got three squares each day, while the rank and file were starving on three moldy hardtacks."

"Remember that these arrogant and overbearing officers were commissioned because they hadn't energy enough to work, brains enough to beg, or courage enough to steal."

"Remember that the American workers had no quarrel with the Spanish workers, anyway."

"Remember that the acquisition of Cuba and the Philippines never raised your wages, shortened your hours, or otherwise bettered your conditions."

"Remember the pensions the men didn't get."

"Remember those who were maimed, mutilated, and disfigured for life."

"Remember the boys who never came back."

"Think of the widows, think of the orphans, think of yourself."

"Let those who own the country do the fighting!"

"Put the wealthiest in the front ranks; the middle class next; follow these with judges, lawyers, preachers, and politicians. Let the workers remain at home and enjoy what they produce. Follow a declaration of war with an immediate call for a general strike. Make the slogan 'Rebellion sooner than war.' Don't make yourself a target in order to fatten Rockefeller, Morgan, Carnegie, the Rothschilds, Guggenheim, and the other industrial plagues."

"American capitalists want war in order to seize rich lands; gain railway, mining, and other concessions; unload their surplus stock of shoddy goods upon the Government; secure investment for their money in interest-bearing bonds; and to kill off the surplus of unemployed workers who are threatening to overthrow the capitalist system."

"Workers of the world, unite!"

"Don't become hired murderers."

"Don't join the Army or Navy."

Quoted from the Industrial Worker, April 14, 1917, editorial:

"To members of the I. W. W.: We would suggest that they literally follow the demands of the capitalist press and stand behind the President. It is only by getting in front of politicians and capitalists that workers court destruction. The I. W. W. will not permit the movement to be switched away from the industrial organization, which alone can be effectively and constructively antimilitaristic, because it is anti-capitalistic."

Quoted from the Industrial Worker, May 1, 1917, editorial:

"We are confined to no country, no flag. Our songs herald your overthrow. This is our day. We are the forgers of revolution, the destroyers of the old and the outgrown. We are the nemesis of idlers, the doom of masters, the emancipation of slaves. We are revolt. We are progress, we are revolution."

(b) Liberty loan.

Quoted from the Industrial Worker, June 2, 1917, editorial:

"If the United States Government must issue bonds, they should at least be issued under such conditions as would leave the workers the liberty to buy them only when they desire to do so, instead of making them a weapon of involuntary industrial servitude."

(c) The Red Cross.

Quoted from the Industrial Worker, May 1, 1917, editorial:

"The Red Cross pledge has as its purpose to double-cross the agricultural workers' organization of the I. W. W. * * * We have nothing against the Red Cross, except that as it is the evident purpose of our present civilization to injure and destroy as many workers' lives as possible, its function is at least doubtful."

V. CRITICISM OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

Quoted from the Industrial Worker, November 10, 1917, editorial:

"It is the contention of the I. W. W. that the political form of government is only a mask. * * * There are apparently Senators and Representatives from the various States of the Union, and, indeed, they are elected from those arbitrary divisions. But upon observing the activities of the various so-called Representatives we find that one represents the allied railway interests, another the oil interests, another the mining industry, still another the lumber interests, and all of them represent the money interests. * * * We do not desire the government of men in the way that requires a body to govern and a body to be governed, a ruler and a subject class. What we want is an administration of things."

Quoted from Solidarity, Chicago, Ill., March 17, 1917, page 2:

"And besides the private armies of the rich and the scab-herding blue coat or yellow leg of the municipal, State, or Federal forces, and the paid preacher of contentment at all costs, the legislator is loosened upon us. The big thieves with bloody hands have raised their raucous voices screaming to heaven and hell for the upholding of 'law and order.' And it so happens that we have laws against picketing, laws against unionism, laws against strikes, and, now, laws against sabotage. In their blindness and stupidity the masters of bread are trying to legislate the weapons out of our hands. Unlike the workers, they are impotent to use industrial power to gain their ends, and so they are trying to stem the great, onrushing human tide of working-class organization with a handful of dusty law books! As long as the master class is parasitical, any 'laws' they make are invalid. The parasite has no business on the back of the worker. The working class is a law unto itself. 'It is the historic mission of the working class to do away with capitalism.' Let them legislate against history if they can!"

"The workers have been stripped of everything but their labor power. They have nothing more to lose and everything to gain. They are awakening to a realization of what can be done with the mighty power that modern industry has placed in their hands. They are learning the value of organization and direct action. They are discarding antiquated weapons and are going forth into the wilderness of capitalism to conquer it and make it blossom forth with the new civilization. The battle waxes fiercer each day but the goal is in sight. The old order is crumbling and the industrial unions of the awakened workers are already organizing the slaves to carry on production when capitalism shall have been overthrown. What matters, then, the virulent vapors of a few labor-hating lawmakers who have 'filled their bellies with the east wind'?"

"And until the slaves of this country wrest the reins of power from the boss class and put a stop to the present bloody carnival of greed—until they organize in one big union to gain industrial freedom for themselves—liberty will be a lie, America will be a slave pen, and her people will be peons."

Quoted from Solidarity, Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1917, page 2:

"In response to the declaration of amnesty for all offenses against the old autocracy, exiles are beginning to return from Siberia and abroad. To all appearances Russia is breaking the chains of autocracy just at the time these chains are being forced upon the 'sovereign American citizen'; 'the land of the free' is taking the place of 'darkest Russia' as the world's chief champion of oppression. And with union men in America being persecuted, jailed, hung, shot, and deported the term 'Americanized' bids fair to replace 'Russian' as a term designating arbitrary and despotic repression. And in place of Russian refugees seeking shelter in the United States from tyranny at home will be persecuted Americans who will be driven to Russia for a haven of refuge from the iron heel of American plutocracy?"

Quoted from Solidarity, March 17, 1917. Editorial:

"THE LAND OF THE FREE."

"A story is told of a young East Indian, who, upon first seeing the big 'lady with the torch' in New York Harbor, asked a fellow passenger 'To whom was that statue built?' 'That,' was the reply, 'is the Statue of Liberty.' 'Ah,' came the startling comment, 'we, in India, erect statues to our dead just as you do in America.'"

"Those persons of the middle and upper classes who are living in snug comfort and uneventful security, and whose predatory propensities are protected by the 'law' and sanctioned by custom and the prevailing code of robber ethics—labor drivers and labor exploiters—clean of conscience and respectable of appearance; all such, are loud in proclaiming that we are living in the 'land of the free.' And from their point of view they are right; there is freedom in America—for them."

"Amongst the unawakened, chloroformed slaves—the 'scissorbills' who are determined to be contented at all costs—the old 'My country, 'tis of thee' idea still prevails; but the workers who have been awakened by harsh experience have found out that their only 'freedom' is their freedom to work—or starve."

"Comparative freedom at one time did exist in this country. The Pilgrims of New England and the early settlers of the South found it here. And they prized it highly and kept it for themselves. The young capitalist class that thrived so vigorously during the stormy days of the birth of the Republic wanted freedom, freedom from the domination and dictation of British capitalists. And they got their freedom and kept it for themselves. The words of men like Paine and Jefferson show that freedom—and freedom in a broad sense—was the aim and object of their lives. But how could they have had at that time the prophetic eyes to see what tremendous changes industrial development would make in the course of events? How could they have seen in their day, that a time would come when the political governments of the world would be mere puppets in the hands of a grasping and brutal plutocracy?"

"And this is the way in which the unbroken thread of 'freedom' is woven into the history of these States: In the early days, when we were a small people living in a great land, there was 'freedom' enough to go around. The land was rich, the stakes were high, and the game was open for all. One man had as much chance as another to get a clutch on the vast resources of the country and squeeze from them the golden prize. At one time it was an impossibility to get a man to work for wages in the Eastern States. Why should one man work for another when he could go West and find independence and 'freedom'? Always a little farther west—free land, growing towns, and the virgin sod waiting to be turned over, settlements spreading like prairie fires, offering rich rewards for the thrifty and industrious. The freedom of the frontier, of the cattle trails, and the range. The freedom that produced the wild, rugged bearded types of Americans that are now extinct, replaced by the sallow faced, sullen, many-tongued race of slaves who depend upon a 'job' for their bread and who love their unions far more than they do their master's government and who band together against the boss and his henchmen, just as the frontiersmen banded together against the Indians."

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, during the month of September last the National Woman Suffrage Association concluded to ascertain the sentiment of the country as far as it might be expressed by representative people of the country concerning the woman-suffrage amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The conference report on the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. I, of course, do not want to interfere with the Senator's speech under any circumstances.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will state to the Senator that I do not expect to make a speech, and I shall occupy only a few moments.

Mr. HARDWICK. Would the Senator be willing to let us dispose of the conference report first?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I think the matter which I have to present will be disposed of in 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well; I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. From various representative people of the country, such as governors, judges, members of legislatures, mayors, a vast number of petitions were obtained, and these petitions have been placed in my possession by the association referred to. They occupy several volumes, and out of order I desire to present them to the Senate at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the petitions will be received. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will state further that this morning I received a telegram from Hot Springs, Ark., from the president of the General Federation of Woman Suffrage Clubs in which the following request of the Senate is made. The telegram is addressed to the Senate in my care:

HOT SPRINGS, ARK., May 3, 1913.

THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Care Senator A. A. JONES,
Chairman Woman's Suffrage Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

The fourteenth biennial convention of General Federation of Women's Clubs, assembled at Hot Springs, Ark., representing two and a half million women of the United States, earnestly request your honorable body to take immediate action favorable on the pending resolution to submit a Federal suffrage amendment to the several State legislatures that democracy in the United States may be completed.

JOSE V. P. COWLES,

President General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, for the past two weeks I have been literally bombarded with letters and telegrams urging action on the constitutional amendment. I have been compelled to answer that I did not know when it would come up. If it is proper for me to do so, I would like to ask the Senator from New Mexico, who is in charge of the joint resolution, what his purpose is, if any, looking to a vote on the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Anticipating that some such request might be made of me when the petitions were presented, I will state that this morning there was a meeting of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, called for the express purpose of considering a time to bring the joint resolution to a vote.

I desire at this time, in order to straighten out the parliamentary situation of the joint resolution, to ask that House joint resolution No. 200, which is at present before the Senate, as I understand it, and has not been referred to the committee, and which is identical with the joint resolution heretofore reported to this body by the committee, be placed upon the calendar for action without reference to the committee.

Mr. GALLINGER. Taking the place of the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Taking the place of the joint resolution which has been reported by the committee and which is now on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator submit that request?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KING. May I ask the Senator, before final action on the request, what is the intention as to calling up the joint resolution for consideration by the Senate?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will state that as soon as the consent asked for is granted, if it be granted, I shall make a request in regard to fixing a time for a vote upon it.

Mr. KING. If it would mean a vote this week, I shall object, but if it means a vote not earlier than next week—

Mr. HARDWICK. The unfinished business is before the Senate. The Senator can only get the floor for the purpose of making a speech. He can not make a request to fix a time for a vote.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I agree that everything which is done here must be done by unanimous consent. I do not understand the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to object to the substitution of the House joint resolution for the Senate joint resolution upon the calendar.

Mr. KING. I will not do so if the Senator will assure me he does not intend to press it for consideration within the next few days.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will state to the Senator that the committee this morning decided to request the Senate for an agreement to vote upon the joint resolution some time during the latter part of this week, either Thursday, Friday, or Saturday.

Mr. KING. I shall not object to the motion of the Senator for substitution, but if the Senator should ask for a vote this week I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Out of order the Senator from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that the House joint resolution be substituted for the Senate joint resolution and states that they are identical. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I am directed by the committee to make this further request. I am sorry to have the objection of the Senator from Utah in advance, but in carrying out the mandate of the committee I will make the request that on the calendar day of Thursday we proceed to vote upon the joint resolution. I will state in advance that it is not the purpose of myself to discuss the question. I do not believe that any vote in this body will be changed by the discussion of the question. It is one which has been a very live subject for many years, and it seems to me that in view of the other business pressing before the Senate we might now simply fix a time for a vote; but, of course, if any Senator desires to discuss the joint resolution before that time doubtless the Senator would be glad to hear him. However, acting for the committee, I have not concluded to take up any of the time of the Senate in its discussion.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, at the hour of 4 o'clock in the afternoon, the Senate will proceed to vote upon the joint resolution.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Under the rules of the Senate can the Senator from New Mexico submit a request like that without a roll call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that before consent can be given it will be necessary to call the roll.

Mr. HARDWICK. Would not that have the effect of displacing the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand the conference report is now before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it possible to make a request to vote upon a certain bill unless that bill is before the Senate? I understand the conference report is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it is competent to submit a request for unanimous consent to fix a time to vote upon a bill, but that the objection of any Senator would prevent it.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am going to make a suggestion to the Senator from New Mexico, if he will permit me.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will be delighted.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is that he ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be made a special order for a certain day. That request is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That is in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Then, we would have that day to discuss it, and during that time the Senator could make a request for unanimous consent to vote on it if it could not be disposed of during that day.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In view of the statement of the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], which I know was made for some very good reason, I will change the request for the one just suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. To be made a special order.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I make the request that the joint resolution be made the special order for next Thursday at the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator can move it, but he had better make it Friday.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I understand that a motion to make it a special order will not be in order at this time, but I give notice that during the morning hour to-morrow I shall make such a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is before the Senate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the Senator from Georgia will yield for the purpose of letting me make that motion, it will be perfectly in order.

Mr. HARDWICK. I hope the Senator will not interfere with the conference report. We have 123,000 soldiers who ought to be naturalized before we send them to Europe. They are aliens, and they ought to be naturalized.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It will not take—

Mr. HARDWICK. I think it more important to get soldiers to the battle line than it is to get women to the polls. I hope the Senator will let me get through with the conference report; it will not take long; and then this matter can be brought up again.

AMENDMENT OF NATURALIZATION LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization.

Mr. HARDWICK. Several of the countries of Europe—Italy, France, I believe, but certainly Germany—

Mr. NORRIS. And Russia.

Mr. HARDWICK. And Russia—I thank the Senator from Nebraska for the suggestion; Russia was the one I was trying to think of—have always contended that they do not release their citizens or subjects from the obligation of citizenship to those countries because they became naturalized here. We have been unable to secure satisfactory treaty arrangements with any one of the countries I have mentioned, and possibly with others on that subject.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will permit me to finish this sentence, then I will yield to him. But Germany is the only country, so far as I know or have been able to discover, that has ever passed a law which expressly authorized the subjects of Germany to immigrate to a foreign country to become naturalized in that country and still to retain their citizenship in Germany merely by filing some sort of a notice with any German consul to whom they can get.

Mr. KENYON. Was that law passed in 1913?

Mr. HARDWICK. No; that law was passed, I think, exactly on the 1st day of January, 1914. It was evidently, as the Senator from Massachusetts has said, preparatory to this war; it was a part of their proposition, although it was not different from the policy that that country and several other countries had consistently maintained on this subject for quite a while.

Now, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia made reference to certain countries having double citizenship. Of course, it is very important to know exactly the countries who have that sort of law, but I do not think France has such a law, I will say to the Senator, though I may be mistaken.

Mr. HARDWICK. I did not say positively France had such a law. I said there were certain countries who had such a statute. If I did say that France had such a law I expressed myself very unhappily.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator, I thought, included France.

Mr. HARDWICK. I may be in error about that; indeed I believe I am. Let us see. Those countries are Russia and Italy, but I am not sure about France; I will not say certainly that France has such a law, but I did not say that any of those countries recognized double citizenship. I said those countries had always claimed, and they still claim, so far as I know, that their citizens or subjects who came to this country or who went to any other foreign country did not thereby get rid of their obligations to them, and that we had not been able to get satisfactory treaties on that subject with those countries. The Senator from North Dakota may be right, and France may not be among such countries. Russia is, I know; Italy is, I know; and Germany also is. I know that in Germany the movement has gone further than it has anywhere else. There it has taken the form of law passed by their parliamentary body, the Reichstag, which provides minutely and in detail how German citizens who migrate to America or Canada or Australia or anywhere else can naturalize under the laws of those countries and still at the same time retain their German citizenship. Of course nobody favors that. We ought not to have in this country naturalized by law any citizen of the United States who does not hold a single and undivided allegiance to this country, and who does not renounce with all his heart and soul and with all sincerity all allegiance to any and every foreign power, prince, and potentate.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I think the Senator from Georgia states that a little broadly. I do not think that they retain their full citizenship; but in Germany I know they will not release them from military duty. That is true as to the country of Russia, and it may be true with reference to Italy. I do not think, however, that such citizens have double citizenship in those countries, but they are subject to military duty.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator please, I shall be glad to have him look that up. If I can get time to do so, and I presume I can, I shall put the German law into the Record. The German law expressly provides that German subjects shall retain their full citizenship, provided they go to a German consul and file notice that they intend to do so. That is, of course, encouraging double dealing.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Georgia will put that law into the Record. I think it would be very interesting.

Mr. HARDWICK. The act was passed January 1, 1914. I have forgotten the name of the act, but it was named after one of the German Reichstag members.

Mr. THOMAS. Dellbruch.

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; the Dellbruch law. I thank the Senator from Colorado. That is the name. It was evidently a part of the parliamentary preparation of Germany for this war.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] offered an amendment, which we accepted, providing hereafter, except as is provided in section 11 for those people who had already come, we would not permit people who resided in any country which country had a law providing for double citizenship and for them retaining citizenship at home at the same time that they obtained citizenship here, that we would not have them naturalized at all. It was a pretty serious proposition, but the Senate accepted the amendment; I accepted it, so far as I was concerned, as I said to the Senator from Massachusetts, with some doubt. I was inclined to think it went too far, and I will tell you why. Suppose a man is leaving a foreign country, renouncing his allegiance to it in all sincerity—opposed to its laws and to its institutions—and coming here, intending to live here permanently and to give this country his undivided allegiance for the balance of his life; he can not help what sort of a law they have passed back there. The fact that they will pass such laws as that might be one of the very reasons which induce him to come here and make him a good American citizen when he gets here. It looks very harsh to penalize a man of that class, from whatever country he may come, because the Government that he is renouncing has done something which he

can not help. That was the reason why I said at the beginning that I doubted the wisdom of the policy announced by the Senator from Massachusetts.

But the conferees—and especially our brethren on the part of the other House who are acting with us in this matter—insisted on this: They said, substantially, there is no country on earth that has a law like this, except Germany, and under the law and under present conditions German immigrants can not come here, anyway, during the war. When we enact a law on this subject, so far as it relates to Germany, we may find ourselves, if peace ever comes between the countries, bound by the stipulation of some treaty agreement. We do not know what may be provided in the treaty that the Governments of the two countries may make on this subject. If they ever are again at peace. So, since none of them can come here, anyway, during the war, and Germany is the only country that has such a law, and there can be no occasion for any German coming here during the war as an immigrant, we had better not cross that bridge until we get to it; we had better wait until the war is over and then deal with this question, especially since the Bureau of Naturalization did not think well of the amendment. They say that they have already under existing Federal law authority to cancel naturalization proceedings where it can be shown that any such double dealing as that has taken place. For that reason the House conferees urged that this amendment—

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to ask the Senator whether in his consideration of this subject he has found any great number of cases where such double citizenship has been indulged in as a practice?

Mr. HARDWICK. I can only say to the Senator that the Assistant Commissioner of Naturalization told the conference committee that there were several such cases. I did not ask him how many. I do not myself know. I do not know to what extent it has been practiced. Of course, the difficulty about it is in getting the evidence. That was why the Senator from Massachusetts insisted that we ought to just exclude them all arbitrarily by law. They may go to a consul's office, but we can never find it out. I think, however, I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, on the assurance of the Naturalization Bureau, that there have been cases where that has been done.

Mr. McCUMBER. Such cases are extremely few compared to the vast number who have come here from Germany?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know. I imagine, however, compared to the total number of emigrants from Germany, such cases must be extremely few, and I reckon that the Senator has not stated it too strongly. I do not suppose there could be a great number, but Germany can send no more emigrants here during the war, and there is no immediate necessity for disposing of this question. The bureau did not think it was best to dispose of it now, and, of course, the Senator from Massachusetts presented rather an extreme proposition.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Georgia has fully dealt with that particular branch of the subject, I want to ask him about the other nations which do not recognize the naturalization of their people—Russia, for instance. Of course, it is beyond our power to reach the question, but Russia and the other countries the Senator has mentioned, particularly Russia—

Mr. HARDWICK. And Italy; we have had a great deal of diplomatic correspondence with Italy about it.

Mr. NORRIS. Russia and other countries—and I have come in contact with the question a good many times myself—refuse to—

Mr. HARDWICK. To recognize expatriation.

Mr. NORRIS. To recognize the naturalization by our laws of anyone who has emigrated from those countries. I know that the State Department for a great many years has been careful to avoid issuing passports to former citizens of those countries, because they feared difficulty might arise if one of those naturalized citizens should go back, and, for instance, be drafted into the army or something of that kind. In such event very serious international complications might arise. I wonder if in the investigation the Senator has made he discovered any adjudication that has ever been made on the subject? Has there been any decision of that question by the departments of our Government and by those other governments? Has the question ever been decided by any tribunal that would make it final and binding upon the nations?

Mr. HARDWICK. It is, of course, as the Senator realizes, a question of international law. There are numerous instances in which this Government has asserted to the fullest extent and in the most vigorous manner its own claims with respect to this matter—that naturalized citizens were expatriated from whatever country they had come—and that the United States would protect those naturalized citizens in their rights as fully as they would protect American-born citizens; that has been done; but I can say also to the Senator that has been a subject of very extensive diplomatic controversy. We have been for years trying to get the Governments of Italy and of Russia, and I think of Germany—we did for a while, I know, negotiate with Germany—to enter into some agreement, which should be mutual and reciprocal, upon the question of expatriation from one country to another, and vice versa. So far we have not succeeded with those three countries, at least, and those are the principal countries we have trouble with on this question; but it is a most important question for the Government in the future to succeed in getting treaties that will fully cover this question and will fully safeguard and protect the rights of these people and fully establish the national rights of this country with regard to this matter.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question. As he says, it is a question of international law. Has he investigated to ascertain what the authorities on international law hold on the subject? Suppose the question arose between our Government and Russia, for instance—

Mr. HARDWICK. It has arisen.

Mr. NORRIS. Where a naturalized Russian had gone back to Russia and they had refused to admit that he had become an American citizen, and that question had to be passed on as a legal proposition, without regard to any treaty between the two Nations—of course, if there were a treaty that would be the law that would govern—what would govern the determination of that question?

Mr. HARDWICK. I think there have been instances where military service has been exacted of naturalized American citizens. Although I have not made any recent investigation of the matter, I am pretty sure that has been done.

Mr. NORRIS. I think there are a good many cases where military service has been exacted, but that has been decided by one government.

Mr. HARDWICK. Exactly; that is the difficulty about it; there is no court to decide it but the Russian court; there is no international court; our courts would hold one way and the Russian courts the other way.

Mr. NORRIS. What do the writers of international law hold?

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I think the soundest view and the most general view—although you find some authorities in those countries dissenting with regard to that—is that when a citizen emigrates from one country and becomes naturalized in another he expatriates himself from the country from which he emigrates. That is undoubtedly the sound view, and that must be the policy of this Government. I regard it as a matter of the utmost importance that as soon as may be this Government shall negotiate treaties of that character with every important country on the face of the earth; and I am almost prepared to say that, even if it may work hardships in some individual cases, if we can not finally secure treaties covering the matter, I am willing to exclude emigrants from countries of that kind and character, because it makes too much trouble. It is a harsh thing to do—I gave you the argument on the other side of it a moment ago—it is a very harsh remedy, and I do not think that we ought to do it now, when there is nothing to be served by it. Therefore the conferees on the part of the Senate receded from the Senate amendment on this question.

Mr. President, I think that covers the substance of the conference report. The bill is not really substantially different from the form in which it left the Senate, except that the Lodge amendment is no longer in the bill. I hope that the conference report may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I move that the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women, which is now on the calendar, be made the special order of business for 1 o'clock on Thursday next.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, would the Senator just as soon make that Friday? I offer that suggestion because Senators may be absent who would like to be present, and it would be

difficult for them to get here before Friday. I am in favor of the Senator's motion, and shall vote with him, but Friday would give every Senator who may now be away an opportunity to be present.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am willing to change the date to Friday.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Hollis	Nugent	Sutherland
Calder	Johnson, Cal.	Page	Thomas
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Thompson
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Polindexter	Tillman
Curtis	Kenyon	Pomerene	Trammell
Dillingham	King	Ransdell	Underwood
Fall	Kirby	Reed	Vardaman
Fletcher	Knox	Robinson	Walsh
France	Lewis	Saulsbury	Warren
Gallinger	McCumber	Sheppard	Watson
Gerry	McKellar	Simmons	Williams
Gronna	McLean	Smith, S. C.	
Hardwick	McNary	Smoot	
Henderson	Norris	Sterling	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] that House joint resolution No. 200 be made the special order for Friday next at 1 o'clock. As many as favor agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico will vote "aye," those opposed "no." The ayes—

Mr. SMOOT. I ask for a division. I think there ought to be a division, anyhow.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMOOT. I think there ought to be a division, as it requires a two-thirds vote to adopt the motion.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Let us have a roll call, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is there a second?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I do not see him in his seat, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. I think he is in the city now, but I do not see him present, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SIMMONS (when Mr. OVERMAN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. OVERMAN] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ASHURST (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Arizona was called). Mr. colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] is absent from the Senate by reason of a death in his family. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], who is absent from the Chamber. Therefore I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. JONES of Washington (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family. I understand that if he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I am advised that, if present, he would vote as I intend to vote, and accordingly I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. On

this question he would vote as I propose to vote. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a standing pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. Being unable to secure a transfer of that pair, I am unable to vote; but I desire to be counted as present for a quorum.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have announced my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I have since been informed that if the Senator from Maryland were present he would vote against this motion. As I would vote the same way, I feel at liberty to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and vote "nay."

Mr. LENROOT. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GUION]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the negative). I wish to inquire whether the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have a pair with that Senator which I transfer to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and will let my vote stand.

Mr. REED. Under the announcement just made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] as to the transfer of his pair to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have a general pair, I am at liberty to vote and vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent because of illness in his family. My information is that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I find that I can transfer my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I therefore make the transfer and vote "nay."

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] because of official necessity, and to say that, were he present, I am advised that he would vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is unavoidably absent on account of illness. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], but as he would vote as I have voted, I will let my vote stand.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 21, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Ashurst	Gronna	McKellar	Shafroth
Beckham	Henderson	New	Sheppard
Calder	Hollis	Norris	Sherman
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	Nugent	Smoot
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Sterling
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Phelan	Sutherland
Curtis	Kenyon	Pittman	Thompson
France	Kirby	Polindexter	Walsh
Gallinger	Lenroot	Ransdell	Warren
Gerry	Lewis	Robinson	Watson

NAYS—21.

Bankhead	McLean	Simmons	Vardaman
Dillingham	Martin	Smith, S. C.	Weeks
Fletcher	Pomerene	Swanson	Williams
Hardwick	Reed	Tillman	
Knox	Saulsbury	Trammell	
Lodge	Shields	Underwood	

NOT VOTING—34.

Baird	Gulon	La Follette	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Hale	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Brandagee	Harding	McNary	Smith, Mich.
Cummins	Hitchcock	Myers	Thomas
Fall	James	Nelson	Townsend
Fernald	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	Kellogg	Owen	Wolcott
Goff	Kendrick	Penrose	
Gore	King	Smith, Ariz.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not having the necessary two-thirds, the motion of the Senator from New Mexico is lost.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I desire to announce that on Friday, May 10, 1918, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall move to take up for consideration House joint resolution 200, known as the woman-suffrage amendment. I make this announcement so that Senators may be advised and may be present.

POSTAGE RATES ON AIRPLANE MAIL.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4208, authorizing postage rates on airplane mail.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 4208) authorizing postage rates on airplane mail.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, on May 15 aerial mail service will be inaugurated between New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. No authority has been given to the Postmaster General to fix the rate for this service. It is necessary to the proper inauguration of the service that the rate be fixed and the object of the bill is to clothe the Postmaster General with the requisite authority. I ask that the bill be read. It is short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may require the payment of postage on mail carried by airplane at not exceeding 24 cents per ounce or fraction thereof.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Texas if it is practically understood that the rate of postage will be 24 cents?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is to be the maximum rate, Mr. President, although I am not advised as to what is the exact intention of the Postmaster General.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if we are to establish a postal route on which it will cost 24 cents an ounce to transmit a letter, I think we might as well abandon the scheme at one time as another. It may amuse somebody for two or three days, but my impression is that it never will become a reality. However, perhaps it is well enough to try the experiment. It will be about a two-days' wonder, not a seven-days' wonder; there is no question about that.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, while I was a Member of the House of Representatives, on June 14, 1910, I introduced in the House a bill to investigate the advisability of establishing an aerial mail route, which I think was the first bill ever introduced in Congress on the subject. I desire to have that bill incorporated in the Record in this connection, as well as the humorous and somewhat skeptical comments of the New York Telegraph on the bill at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[H. R. 26833, 61st Cong., 2d sess. In the House of Representatives, June 14, 1910. Mr. SHEPPARD introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed:]

A bill for an investigation to determine the practicability and cost of an aeroplane or airship mail route.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to investigate the practicability and cost of an aeroplane or airship mail route between the city of Washington and some other suitable point or points for the experiment and report the results of said investigation to Congress at the opening of the short session in December next, in order that it may be definitely determined whether aerial navigation may be utilized for the safe and more rapid transmission of the mails.

[From the New York Telegraph, June 19, 1910.]

AEROPLANE MAIL COLLECTORS AND CHUTES TO SHOOT UPWARD—REPRESENTATIVE SHEPPARD URGES POSTMASTER GENERAL TO INVESTIGATE FEASIBILITY OF SCHEME TO QUICKEN LOCAL TRANSPORTATION OF LETTERS.

And when the mail chutes go up and not down, where will we go to post our letters? Will we take elevators or tip the janitors to carry them to the slot?

In these times it is well to give the subject a little forethought. Forethought is the only word that can be correctly used in facing aeroplane possibilities. If there is to be an aeroplane mail service, as the Texas Representative thinks, now is the time to prepare for it.

A modern apartment will be thus equipped with its aerial mail box, and the postman will flit in the air once every hour.

Representative SHEPPARD's resolution authorizes and directs the Postmaster General to investigate the practicability and cost of an aeroplane or airship mail route between the city of Washington and some other point or points suitable for experiment. "The aim is to find out if aerial navigation may be utilized for safe and more rapid transmission of mails."

But it is doubtful if aerial legislation will be reached at this session in Washington. By this is meant that we are given time to prepare.

If a propeller breaks in a Jersey swamp or a rudder gets anchored in a Rocky Mountain peak, don't fuss because your mail is delayed. Hasn't a blizzard or a washout held letters up before?

By a series of signals you may let the postman navigator know the sort of letters you are expecting. This will aid him in his work and assist in accurate delivery.

Love letters will be carried in a rose-pink aeroplane, steered by Cupid's wings and operated by perfumed gasoline. If you are awaiting a love letter, stand with one foot on the edge of your roof and place the right hand over your heart. This ship's name is *Dearie*.

If you owe money, lock yourself in your flat and refuse to believe in signs. Bills and missives from collecting agencies will be a special cargo of a dull-gray ship charged to carry 13,000,000 pounds of first-class dunning matter.

This aeroplane will descend with a roar and will emit fumes of gasoline at the chute. When it soars away it will send an echo that can be heard for 33 miles. Name this ship *What's the Use*.

Letters from mine promoters and from the Optimist Society will carry a brass band in the bow, will be painted yellow, and will be named *Cheer Up*.

Postmen will wear wired coat tails and on their feet will be wings. A postman's feet will hereafter be a study for ornamentation. Decorative designs will be used in profusion, as, naturally, feet will be quite unnecessary things in postal delivery.

This is the day for one-legged and no-legged men. Civil-service examinations will consist of questions hitherto unknown.

"What is your reach?" will be the question by which the examining board will test a man's endurance.

There will be another ship which must be reckoned with—conveying letters from reformers, those who are mad for social uplift. It will be called *Hot Air*, and will be operated by many of our best known and most highly respected muckrakers.

No man can apply for a job on this unless he has eaten a bad piece of meat, choked on diluted milk, or intimately knows of white slavery.

The Government will have no jurisdiction over the management of this ship, but will be held responsible for any ills received and given, for any accidents due to bad judgment or caused by a hasty preparation for the flight. The ship will be bright red, and the engine will run to the strain of "Marseillaise." It will be called *Liberty*. Julius Hopp is writing a poem for its dedication.

That's about all for the present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if it is in contemplation for the Government to go into the business of manufacturing or purchasing airplanes to carry out this enterprise?

Mr. SHEPPARD. My understanding is that the Post Office Department will use such planes as the War Department may let them have.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, to my mind it is about as absurd an enterprise as ever was thought of without more complete investigation and the development of more accurate facts, but, as I said a moment ago, it may serve to amuse somebody. It will be about a two days' wonder, and in my judgment that will be the end of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3783, to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that motion debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks it is, after the morning hour.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President I have had occasion during the investigation of the so-called aviation program—

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to inquire of the Senator who made the motion to take up this bill and of the Senator who now has the floor if they would object to allowing me an opportunity to try to pass the rent-profiteering joint resolution respecting the District of Columbia? I fancy it will take only a very few minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I am perfectly willing to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator who made the motion and the Senator who has the floor will agree to do that, I think it will delay the matter only a very few minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if I can be assured that I will be recognized to take up this bill after the completion of the consideration of the joint resolution, I have no objection at all to the Senate taking up the joint resolution at this time.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should, of course, be very glad to recognize the Senator under those circumstances if I were in the chair; but I can not undertake to say—

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is no objection, at the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from Delaware if the present occupant of the chair is here he will recognize the Senator from Utah, and if he leaves the chair he will instruct his successor to that effect.

Mr. THOMAS. I shall not object to the making of the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is what the Chair means—that the Senator from Utah will be recognized to make the motion.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that if he will consent to the taking up of the bill, I will ask that it be temporarily laid aside until the Senator from Delaware can proceed with his joint resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. I will not consent to that.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the Senator would not, but I wanted to be perfectly fair to all Senators concerned; and in order to show the Senator from Colorado that I have no desire whatever to make him talk for any great length of time, I am going to say to the Senator that with the statement made by the Chair I am perfectly willing that we shall proceed now with the consideration of the rent measure, if it does not lead to too long discussion.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I fancy that it will not.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, let me say that it is not necessary for the Senator to try to make me talk. I think perhaps he would serve the country better by doing something that would make me keep still. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. I withdraw the motion, Mr. President.

RENTAL OF PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution 152, to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That until the adjournment sine die of the present session of the Congress no judicial order for the recovery of possession of any real estate, now or hereafter held or acquired by oral or written lease, or for the ejectment or dispossession of a tenant therefrom, shall be made, and all leases thereof shall continue so long as the tenant continues to pay rent at the agreed rate and performs the other conditions of the tenancy, except on the ground that the tenant has failed to take reasonable care of the premises, or has committed waste, or has been guilty of conduct which is a nuisance or amounts to a disturbance of the peace of adjoining or neighboring occupiers or a violation of law, or that the premises are reasonably required by a landlord for occupation by himself or his family while in the employ of or officially connected with the Government; and where such order has been made, but not executed before the passage of this resolution, the court by which the order was made may, if it is of the opinion that the order would not have been made if this resolution had been in force at the date of the making of the order, rescind or modify the order in such manner as the court may deem proper for the purpose of giving effect to this resolution: *Provided*, That any provision in any oral or written lease that the same shall be determined or forfeited if the premises shall be sold is hereby declared to be void while this resolution shall be in force, and every purchaser shall take the conveyance of any premises subject to the rights of all tenants in possession thereof under the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the joint resolution now before the Senate was up for discussion when we adjourned on Saturday, or shortly before that time. I do not care to add very much to what I have said; but upon further considering the joint resolution, and upon conferring with my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee who have been particularly interested in this matter, I think that an amendment should be made to the joint resolution, which I will now propose.

I move that the joint resolution be amended by inserting after the word "lease," on line 6 of the first page, the words "for one month or any longer period." The effect of that amendment is to make the joint resolution apply only to cases where the tenure is for a month or longer, and not to apply to daily or weekly tenures, which is manifestly an improvement.

I move the adoption of that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, after the word "lease," it is proposed to insert the words "for one month or any longer period," so that if amended it will read:

now or hereafter held or acquired by oral or written lease for one month or any longer period, or for the ejectment or dispossession—

And so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Delaware what we are to understand by an oral lease?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Merely a lease where a tenant enters into possession under a verbal agreement.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not a lease, then.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Not in writing.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is an agreement; it is not a lease.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Anything which provides for the possession of real estate by a tenant would be technically a lease, I think.

Mr. GALLINGER. I should not think so; but I will not put my lack of legal knowledge against the Senator's fullness of legal knowledge.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I do not profess any such knowledge, but I think I am clear on that point.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me that where there was a so-called oral lease the tenant might claim that the owner said he might occupy the property a certain length of time, and the owner might say, "I did not make any such agreement," and there you are. I think, if the word "oral" is to remain in the joint resolution, that it ought to be "oral agreement," and let them fight it out as to whether they have an agreement or not.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that that would be the case anyway; it would be purely a question of evidence as between the landlord and the tenant. That would be the case in any event.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am going to venture to move that the word "agreement" be placed in the joint resolution after the word "oral," at the end of line 5, page 1, and also in line 11, page 2, so that it will read "oral agreement or written lease."

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have no objection at all, if the Senator desires that amendment to be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when this joint resolution was before the Senate on Saturday I asked that it should go over, because I wanted to look into it. I have not had much time to do that; in fact, I have hardly had time to read it from that time to the present, having much official business on my hands. I then said that it was extraordinary legislation, most unusual legislation, which the Senator from Delaware admitted was the fact.

I am not satisfied as to the wisdom of passing a joint resolution of this kind. The House has passed some kind of a so-called rent-profiteering bill. I have not had time to examine that bill. It is now before the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I presume will soon be presented to this body for consideration. I am not informed, and I do not know that I could by any possibility set in operation an inquiry that would inform me, as to how extended this grievance is, as to how much advantage is being taken of the occupants of buildings or apartments by the owners in the matter of increased rentals.

I can see some objections to this joint resolution. A man owns a little home here. It is leased, and he wants to sell it. The lease is about to expire, or there is an oral agreement that the party occupying it shall occupy it for a month; but he is not permitted to sell it. I think the suggestion has been made here that the bill that will be presented here contains practically the same provision as this; and thus the man who desires to dispose of his property is denied that right by law, although there may be very urgent reasons why he wants to dispose of it. That is a thing that never was dreamed of before, I apprehend, in the history of this country. He is compelled to allow the occupant to remain there, because the law says that he can not eject him under any circumstances.

I know of one case—it is a very exceptional case—where a gentleman owns a house in Washington, not a very high-priced one, and he wants to change the tenant so as to accommodate a man in his employ to whom he is planning to rent the house at a lower rate than he is getting now, \$10 a month less; but he will not be allowed to do it under this provision. Of course, that is only one case; I imagine that it is almost sul generis, but it exists. Poor men have come into my committee room—two of them to-day—to tell me that they have worked hard to acquire little homes, and they have rented their homes, and now they want to occupy them themselves, but under a law of this kind they can not do it.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that under the bill which has been reported to the Senate to-day by the Committee on the District of Columbia both of the cases which he mentions are fully provided for. Any person who wants to occupy the property himself or to have it occupied by his family or by his servants is fully provided for.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very glad to know that, Mr. President. For that reason I think we ought to take up that bill and pass it, in place of passing this joint resolution, which does not provide against the matters of which I have complained.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me for interrupting him, there is no inhibition against the owner of the property selling his property. He can sell his property just in the same way that he always could sell his property, but the tenants of properties in the District are given the right to remain on at the rent which they now pay, provided their tenure is for more than a month, from month to month, and the only hardship on a man who wants to sell his property is that

he can not deliver possession to the person to whom he sells it. If the owner of any property is engaged in any governmental work, he can obtain his property and move into it at any time. The object is—I do not care to interrupt the Senator if he objects, of course.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no; not at all. I am delighted to have the explanation of the Senator.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I shall be very glad to explain the matter. The object of the joint resolution is to provide in every way possible to get places where the people who are engaged in the Government service may sleep and may live in this District.

If I may explain to the Senator, there are about 50,000 employees of the Government under the civil service who have been brought to Washington during the last year. It is anticipated that 35,000 more of them will be brought in between now and the fall. They have all got to be attended to. There are not enough houses here to house everybody, and where a man had actually rented his property it did not seem to the committee to be any hardship to keep him out of it while the Government employees actually needed it. That is the theory of that portion of the joint resolution.

I will speak later as to the great amount of profiteering. I do not want to interrupt the Senator too long.

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that a man not in the Government employ could be dispossessed to give place to a man or a woman who is in the Government employ.

The Senator says that 50,000 Government employees have been brought in during the last year and that 35,000 more are to follow. I do think that, instead of passing a bill of this kind, we might well halt and make an inquiry as to the necessity for the inundation of boys and girls and men and women into the District of Columbia. If anybody knows what on earth they are doing, I confess it is beyond my ability to comprehend.

Mr. President, I am not going to make any factious opposition to this joint resolution. The committee, composed of men in whom I have much confidence, seem to be unanimously in favor of it. But I do want to voice a suggestion, at least—it might be called, possibly, a warning—that in these days of lax economy, in these days, if not of misappropriation of public funds, at least of the reckless use of them, we might well pause and make inquiry as to whether we are not having thousands and tens of thousands of employees, so called—many of whom are doing nothing to earn their salaries, as I happen to know—come into the District of Columbia to dispossess the citizens of their property because it is argued that there is no place for them to sleep.

Mr. President, I have here what I consider a very interesting contribution to this question, in the form of a clipping from a newspaper printed in Augusta, Wis.—the *Augusta Eagle*. This happened to be sent to me a week ago, and I put it in my desk. I have seen somewhat similar mention made in other papers of the great straits the Government is in for more employees, and the fact is being advertised all over the country that all a boy or a girl has to do to get a job is to come to Washington. I think all of those who come here are getting jobs.

I ask that this article from the *Augusta (Wis.) Eagle* may be read. To me it is a very interesting article.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested:

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the *Augusta (Wis.) Eagle*, Apr. 26, 1918.]

THOUSANDS NEEDED AT GOOD SALARIES—20,000 SPECIALISTS WANTED IN ARMY AND NAVY CIVILIAN BRANCHES.

Charging armies and thundering battleships are easy to visualize but not so easy to accomplish. There can be no going "over the top," no paralyzing broadsides, unless to sustain the blow there is material in abundance to back up the human effort.

Right now the civilian branches of the Army and Navy are in urgent need of thousands of highly trained workers, and before this year passes these branches must be increased by at least 20,000. The Ordnance Department of the Army needs great numbers of men who are trained as mechanical engineers, mechanical and other kinds of draftsmen, chemists, metallurgists, and the like. Literally thousands of inspectors are also wanted for the work of passing upon the quality of everything conceivable in the way of ordnance, ammunition, and other munitions. For office work the Ordnance Department wants a great many statisticians, accountants, experts and assistants in business administration, and clerks trained in special lines, such as clerks qualified in business administration, index and catalogue clerks, and clerks qualified in statistics or accounting. The Quartermaster Corps of the Army is in need of several thousand examiners and inspectors of everything that enters into the personal and camp equipment of the soldier. Passenger and freight rate clerks are also wanted in this branch. The Signal Corps of the Army is short of aeronautical mechanical draftsmen. The Navy has an unlimited number of places for draftsmen of various kinds and for a long list of technical workers. Practically all branches of the service are in need of stenographers, typists, bookkeepers, statistical clerks, multigraph operators, and calculating-machine operators.

The United States Civil Service Commission, whose duty it is to fill these civilian positions, urges as a patriotic duty that qualified persons offer their services for this work—work vital to pushing the war. Good salaries are offered, and the work is all in the United States. With the

exception of a few of the clerical positions, applicants will not be assembled for written examinations, but will be rated upon their education, training, and experience, as shown in their applications, supplemented by corroborative evidence. Representatives of the Civil Service Commission at the post offices in all cities are prepared to furnish definite information and application blanks.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is illuminating. I do not know who is responsible for this. It is apparently placed upon the Civil Service Commission. I doubt very much whether the Civil Service Commission is responsible for it.

Mr. KENYON. Is it an advertisement?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not; it is a news item, apparently. I do not know where it originated. The suggestion is there made that they are not even to be required by the Civil Service Commission to take written examinations; that they are to be rated according to some plan that will be devised in the department, upon educational experience or something else.

Now, how is this going to end? If it is necessary to bring in 35,000 more, as the Senator from Delaware suggested, I would be the last man in the world to oppose it; but as I have passed through certain bureaus in the last month and witnessed the apparent incompetence of those who are being employed, and of their negligence, so far as their duties are concerned, and have had some of them tell me they had been there a week and have had nothing to do, I have wondered whether after all it was not a duty devolving upon Congress to ascertain whether or not it is wise to turn the city of Washington upside down, dispossess the owners of property, men who have toiled during a lifetime to obtain a home, to make a place for this inundation, because it is nothing less than that, of Federal employees. If it is necessary let it go on, but it seems to me there ought to be some inquiry concerning it.

Mr. President, I have felt that way, and I feel that way now. I am not going to oppose the joint resolution. If the committee thinks it wise to do this thing let it be done, but I think it would be wiser to take the bill the committee has reported. We could pass that, I judge, as soon as we can pass this joint resolution. Then let it go to conference and let us have legislation on the subject and settle it once for all.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator concerning the resolution which I saw by the papers he introduced. Was it in reference to an investigation as to the new clerks in Washington?

Mr. GALLINGER. No; I offered a resolution on Saturday asking the Committee on Expenditures of the War Department to make an investigation as to the manner in which appropriations for that department had been expended; that is all.

Mr. KENYON. I wish the Senator would introduce a resolution for an investigation of the new clerks. I was told not later than this noon by a gentleman connected with one of these bureaus that there are 2,000 of these clerks to do the work that 600 have been doing, and that 600 could do. I agree with the Senator that there ought to be some kind of an investigation.

Mr. GALLINGER. I feel that way about it, but unless some other Senator agrees with me, or unless the Senate thinks it is necessary to inquire into this matter, I, of course, have no more concern about it than any other Senator; but I really feel that there has been the utmost degree of recklessness employed by the heads of bureaus, if not of departments, in making demands for clerical and other help. As I suggested the other day, I read in the newspapers that a certain official, not the head of a department but a subordinate, said he could use 1,200 stenographers; that he could give them employment. That is too ridiculous for a moment's consideration.

Yet I presume that gentleman would like to have 1,200 good-looking girls or cigarette-smoking young men under his control. But the question is whether we want to do it. If the finances of the Government are in such splendid shape—and I think they are in about as bad a shape as they can be—that we can go on appropriating money without hindrance, adding to the clerical expenses in Washington until we get so many here that they will have to sleep in the park, as they do in Hyde Park in London, perhaps it is wisdom, but it does not appeal to me.

I have on my desk a bill introduced in the other House which, to my mind, has a good deal of sense. I presume we could not get it through either branch of Congress, but it strikes me that it is worthy of consideration. It is a bill to distribute these activities; to let the Shipping Board go to Philadelphia, for instance; to let the Food Administration—I do not think it makes much difference where it goes; to let the Coal Administrator go to some other region than the city of Washington.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator suggest where?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If the Senator will look at the bill which has been reported from the committee he will find that that is provided for.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Vermont interrupts me to say that if I look at the bill that has been reported, even those things have been provided for. All the more reason why we should take that bill up and consider it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I merely wish to suggest to the Senator that one reason why the committee thought it might be wise to pass the joint resolution now—it may be that the Senator in charge of the joint resolution has already stated it—is because the bill we have reported is very radically different from the bill that passed the House. We anticipate that there will be very considerable delay in conference, and that it will probably be a month or two before we can get the legislation through. The situation seems to be so pressing, from the information that came to the committee, that we thought it wise to report the joint resolution for passage.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. If the Senator will allow me, along the same line as the statement just made by the Senator from Washington, there were a great many impelling reasons for the presentation of this joint resolution. One was the vast number of notices which came to our knowledge that had been served upon tenants requiring them either to immediately sign up leases for the ensuing year or to vacate. I have here a copy of one of the notices served by the landlord on a tenant in a large apartment house in which there are probably 40 or 50 or more tenants. I have been told that the same notice was served upon each of the tenants, advising them of an increase in rent of 33½ per cent for the ensuing year, and requiring them to call at the office and sign the new lease on or before May 10. That is just four days hence, and these 40 or more tenants are threatened with dispossession unless they will immediately sign the leases at this increased rental.

Mr. GALLINGER. Those 40 or more tenants have a lease already which will not expire until the 1st day of October.

Mr. POMERENE. That is true.

Mr. GALLINGER. They need not go to the captain's office unless they wish to do so.

Mr. POMERENE. But the Senator overlooks the fact that the apartments will be let to other tenants, so that they will be dispossessed on October 1 unless they sign up for the increased rents. That is the difficulty about it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I apprehend there are cases—and they may be more numerous than I think—where this is going on; but, after all, we are face to face with the fact that 33½ per cent—and I doubt whether that would be exacted in many cases—does not exceed what we are paying in increased prices for everything on earth that we use. I saw two pieces of goods on Saturday, one purchased a few months ago for 35 cents, and exactly the same kind of goods, except it was not as good a quality, a woman paid 85 cents for on Saturday. That is about what we are up against, not only in the city of Washington but everywhere else. I saw a piece of goods that came from New York a few days ago identical with that which was purchased less than one year ago and at exactly double the price it was a year ago.

So I say, I think there is a good deal of feeling engendered against even the owners of apartment houses that may not be quite just. I happen to have a little apartment in an apartment house. I have not been notified of any increase of rent, but I would not be surprised if I would be, and if this increased cost of everything goes on I do not know but what it would be justifiable. I am not advising the owner of the property to increase my rent, but I am not so sure that it would not be a just thing for the owner of the property to do under the circumstances.

Mr. SAULSBURY. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The Senator is expressing some doubt as to the general serving of these notices. While the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] was speaking I looked at the notices he had in his hand which had been sent to him. I have one sent to me identical in every way, printed with the same type, but the names of the apartment houses are different; the names of the people to whom they are addressed are different; the rent is different. The 33½ per cent is precisely the same and the date—May 10—is precisely the same—the time when the tenants are to come to the captain's office. It is a peculiar thing that these notices should be printed and used by different apartment-house owners with those identical characteristics and printed with the same type. It seems to me that that car-

ries out precisely what the committee has been informed—that it is such a general thing in the city that people are willing to take advantage of the necessities of the tenant that it has come to a point where we are convinced it must be attended to.

I will say to the Senator that he will be surprised at the extent of this thing. I have on my desk here a letter from a gentleman almost as well known in this country as Theodore Roosevelt, a man who is looked to as one of the great leaders of progressive thought and conservation. He is a large property owner in the city of Washington, and yet he tells his tenant that if she does not give up possession to him willingly, he will sell that property under the terms of the lease—which provides that in case of sale the tenure may be avoided, and the new landlord may rent it—he will sell that property, to which the tenant is entitled for a year longer, to his own wife for cash, and in that way obtain possession of the property, so that he may get money out of his property to contribute to war relief.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator think a sale of that kind would operate to avoid a lease?

Mr. SAULSBURY. No.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course it would not.

Mr. SAULSBURY. No; and the gentleman who made the threat discovered that it would not. Of course, it would be very interesting—

Mr. FLETCHER. May I make an inquiry, with the permission of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is expected to be accomplished by this provision? Where would you get any relief against those notices, unless you expect Congress to be in session until the 1st of October? The 1st of October I understand the purpose is to oblige the landlords to rent to the tenant or some other tenant at the same price; but if Congress is not in session as late as the 1st of October, the joint resolution does not operate, and you do not afford any relief to those who have received the notices.

Mr. SAULSBURY. With the permission of the Senator from New Hampshire—

Mr. GALLINGER. I have only a word more to say, but I will yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware first.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has called attention to the somewhat unusual exactions, or contemplated exactions, of a gentleman who he says is almost as prominent in the progressive field as Theodore Roosevelt. Is this gentleman also a distinguished advocate of extreme conservation?

Mr. SAULSBURY. He is a great conservationist. That is his chief characteristic in the public eye.

Mr. THOMAS. With a French name?

Mr. SAULSBURY. His first name, I will say, is Gifford.

Mr. REED. And the Senator objects to letting him conserve his own interests?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am not going to let him conserve his own interests at the expense of the Government or at the expense of anybody else, if I can help it by law.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have only a few more words to say. I called attention to what I called an inundation of clerks to the city of Washington. I believe it ought to be stopped, or at least it ought to be investigated before it becomes a peril to other property owners in Washington, if they are to be given a preference in the matter of lodging.

There is one other evil that has come to the city of Washington and to the property owners in the city of Washington, and that is a less inundation of rich men in the city of Washington who are working for a dollar a year. I have in mind a house, I do not know how much it cost but I should think \$100,000 would be a very large amount, more likely it cost from \$50,000 to \$75,000. I know a certain gentleman who on coming to the city offered to pay \$35,000 a year rent for that house. That is not an isolated case. The result is that houses are being vacated in that way, and the former occupants have to find a lodging somewhere. If we have got to give up our homes absolutely to the clerical force of the Government and to the specialists of the Government and the draftsmen of the Government named in that bill—I suppose any girl or boy who can draw a crooked line is a draftsman just as any man who can saw a board, whether he saws it crooked or not, is a carpenter and gets six or seven dollars a day or more—if people who have acquired a home by hard work are to give up their homes for that class of people, there is going to be a turmoil in the city of Washington, and if it is extended to other cities of the Union there will be a trouble that will be very serious, in my judgment.

But, as I said, I have great confidence in this committee. I have no doubt they have worked diligently on this matter, and think this is a necessity, but I would very much prefer taking up the bill they have reported and discussing it and passing it, if it is a wise measure, and I would not be alarmed, as the Senator from Washington is, lest it might be in conference for a long time. We had a bill here the other day which we discussed for several days and the Senator in charge of it prophesied that unless we passed it quickly it would be of no particular use. It went to the House, and the House accepted every amendment we put on, and I suppose we put on 25. If there is any need of this legislation, both Houses of Congress are wise enough and sensible enough to pass a salutary bill, and I think we ought to pass quickly the bill, which I understand has been reported to the Senate in a different draft from that passed by the House, and let it go to conference; but I yield to the combined judgment of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I presume that a measure of this kind is necessary to deal with the situation which we have here. I wish to ask the Senator in charge of the measure if there is any provision under the joint resolution by which a bona fide purchaser of property, for instance, would get possession for his own use?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think the only provision that is made here on that point is that any person who is the owner, or any purchaser if he is in Government employ, could obtain that property for his own use.

Mr. BORAH. Some people who have been paying rent here in apartment houses, and so forth, have come to the conclusion that if they are to stay here they must buy property. I wonder if the Senator feels that it would weaken the force of the joint resolution if we inserted on page 2, line 2, after the word "landlord," the words "or bona fide purchaser."

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think I can answer the Senator that it would probably very greatly interfere with the effect of the joint resolution, and for this reason: As described before the committee, and possibly before the Senate by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM], there is one location of which he happens to know personally—and many such were brought to our attention—where tenants have been given notice in numbers, and an attempt is being made to compel the tenants to buy the property, under threat of a sale to somebody else. If a sale is made to somebody else, they could oust these tenants, even under the guise of coming in as owners, and it would work a hardship which we are seeking to avoid by the joint resolution, because all the tenants might be ousted, and certainly they would be put to the trouble of proving a colorable sale.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me a large latitude ought to be given for legitimate transactions.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I will say to the Senator I would not object very much to a provision of that kind, where the person who bought was moving into the property.

Mr. BORAH. This might accommodate the class of people whom you are seeking to protect by this measure, because it would be a bona fide sale, and it must be for the party's occupation.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator will suggest such an amendment as that, I shall not object to it.

Mr. BORAH. Is an amendment in order now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order.

Mr. BORAH. On page 2, line 2, after the word "landlord," I move to insert the words "or bona fide purchaser," so as to read:

Or that the premises are reasonably required by a landlord or bona fide purchaser for occupation by himself or his family while in the employ of or officially connected with the Government.

Mr. SAULSBURY. For his own occupation.

Mr. BORAH. It says that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to ask the author of the joint resolution how many cases he knows of where the outrages he has depicted are being perpetrated?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Through the testimony given before the committee and through the statement of letters which members of the committee have received, I suppose some hundreds.

Mr. REED. How many hundred?

Mr. POMERENE. I can give the Senator a little information on that subject.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Ohio do so. He is chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. POMERENE. I have another letter from one of the tenants in another apartment house in which there are over

40, and they have all been served with notices. An officer connected with the War Department who has been at times assigned to the special duty of looking after the people who are about to be dispossessed and to try to find living quarters for others connected with that department said to me the other day that in one week he had over a thousand of these notices come to him for his investigation, and that they were constantly coming. It has become so extensive—

Mr. REED. A raise of 33½ per cent?

Mr. POMERENE. I should not say that they were general raises in the rent. I could not say as to the amount of the raises. I may say to the Senator, further, that many of the real estate men who came before our committee stated they believed that something would have to be done in order to protect these people. In other words, there are many real estate brokers and agents very high-class men who feel the necessity of being protected against the outrages which are being perpetrated upon the people by other agents who are engaged in business here in the city.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator know how many thousand tenants there are in Washington, approximately?

Mr. POMERENE. No; I do not think I can tell the Senator the number. This will give a side light on the question which the Senator has asked. It was stated that there were over 200 apartment houses in the city that are being rented. Of course, the Senator is aware that in many of them there are a great many tenants and in others the number is small.

Mr. REED. I suppose in a city of 350,000, like Washington, largely made up of transients, it would not be unsafe to say that 275,000 of them live in rented quarters—perhaps 300,000—and if there are 300,000 and you have complaints from two or three hundred, it is very far from giving any kind of accurate information as to general conditions.

Mr. President, I think that a man who will take advantage of the present situation to grossly increase his rent is a swinish sort of fellow who ought to be consigned to the contempt of every decent man. But that there should be some increase in rent, assuming now that the rents in the past have been reasonable, is absolutely to be expected. The upkeep of a house has enormously increased. If the heat is to be furnished, the coal costs more to the landlord. The janitor service costs a great deal more, and every other element that enters into the upkeep of the building has been increased. The values of property have likewise increased, and it is only natural under those conditions that there should be some reasonable increase in rent. As was suggested by the Senator from Florida, repairs, plumbing bills, and everything of that kind which I think I had previously embraced in my expression "upkeep" should be included. I had my house painted the other day, and I paid twice as much as I would have had to pay when I came here six years ago. The men who own these properties, some of them, may be acting very badly, but let us be careful of two things, that we do not punish the innocent with the guilty, and let us be careful also that we do not too closely imitate the soviet that is just now distinguishing Russia.

I confess to such a feeling of disgust for men who are at a time like this trying to profiteer that I hesitate to say anything in favor even of the property owner who is only exercising the right of a citizen.

But, Mr. President, as is usual with remedies of the kind proposed, they largely defeat themselves. We had notice served upon us a few months ago that building operations must cease in this country. The motive back of that was excellent. It had its effect in the city of Washington, as it did in every other part of the country—the building operations largely ceased. But babies continued to be born, population continued to increase, and to-day the Government of the United States is appropriating \$10,000,000 to build houses in the city of Washington, a large part of which might have been built by private enterprise if it had not been discouraged by governmental interference; and yet it will take as much lumber and just as much steel for the Government to build a lot of claptraps that will ultimately be torn down as it would to have built good buildings to start with. So having discouraged building, we now propose to pass a joint resolution, that is notice duly served upon every man who may dream of building a structure in the city of Washington, that he is not to be secure for one single moment in his rights to own that property, to use that property, and to realize an income from that property.

This joint resolution is the absolute and final stoppage of any building operations in the city of Washington.

No man but an imbecile would ever think of borrowing money, as most of them do who build these great structures, and erecting a great apartment building in the city of Washington, with the knowledge that a joint resolution can be rushed through

Congress any hot afternoon that will deprive him of the use of his property and of the ability to make enough money to pay the interest upon his investment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. As a case in point, Mr. President, I desire to say that I own quite a large building in the city here, and for several weeks one of the leading hotel men in the country has been trying to get me to join with him to put up a large building, not so large as a big hotel, but a very high-class restaurant, with 60 rooms, several stories of rooms, which would be of some little relief to the people who are walking the streets here and who can not get lodging and food to eat; but now we are halted. I would not dare to put any money into the transaction now, and certainly no lessee on a 5 or 10 year lease, after he had contributed part toward the improvement, would dare to take that chance, because the next day any department head might come around and take the property at their own price. That is just an instance in point.

Mr. REED. But, more than that, if the Senator from Connecticut wanted to borrow money, how much money does he think he could borrow on that kind of property—I mean money with which to build?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. We probably could not borrow the money anyway, Mr. President, because the banks decline now to lend on real estate. I sold a building in my home town the other day, and took half the purchase price as a first mortgage, which is as good as gold, and which ordinarily every savings bank and every insurance company in the State would have jumped at; and yet I can not do anything with that mortgage; none of them will take it, and I have got to hold it. You can not get a dollar west of the Allegheny Mountains for anything except to put into active business connected with the war. I am not saying that it is wrong; I am not criticizing it; I am only stating the financial situation.

Mr. REED. The Senator does know, I think, that, if there is any money to be loaned upon real estate, it is not very likely to be loaned upon real estate where Congress exercises the right to confiscate the property or to destroy its use.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course, no business institution, as a trustee for other people's funds, could properly loan a dollar with the threat hanging over it of condemnation at the Government's own price, without a gross betrayal of their duty as such trustee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think there is a way by which these excessive rents can be reached and the Constitution not be raped or the right of contract abrogated. I have not any doubt of the power of Congress within the District of Columbia to lay an excess-profit tax and to lay it in such a way that it would not be profitable for a man to charge these enormous rents, because when he went above a certain point the tax would take away his profits. That, however, is not this joint resolution.

Now, I want to see if I can not challenge the attention of Congress to this matter. I am not going to be very long about it. I do not know whether or not it will do a bit of good. There are many people who think they can cure everything by simply passing a resolution. They think that over in Russia. But I say that when the Congress of the United States shows its disregard for the Constitution and the laws of the land they sow the dragon's teeth, from which spring up the Industrial Workers of the World organization, the anarchists, and that class of socialists who disregard law and constitutions and property rights.

When in high places we snap our fingers in the face of the law of this land, how can we expect otherwise than that the soap-box orator, the ignorant, and the depraved will likewise snap their fingers in the face of authority?

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. While I agree with the Senator that what he suggests does make socialists, does not the profiteering which is going on in this country and the profiteering that is going on in this District, that would make Capt. Kidd turn green with envy, also create socialists just as fast as anything else can do it in this country?

Mr. REED. I do not think so.

Mr. KENYON. I think it does.

Mr. REED. But I have already suggested that there is a constitutional way by which the greater part of it can be

reached. What is this joint resolution? It is a bald, naked, unblushing abrogation of the rights of property; it is a bald, naked, unblushing attempt to violate the obligations of contract. It does not bring forth even the shadow of a pretense behind which it can conceal its ugly visage.

Mr. KENYON. This joint resolution is to continue only during the session of Congress, in order that a remedy may be worked out; it is merely a moratorium.

Mr. REED. But a resolution to set aside the Constitution of the United States for 15 minutes is just as vicious in principle as one would be to set it aside for 15 years. The Senate of the United States ought to guard the Constitution that its Members have sworn they will guard. When we undertake by a simple joint resolution to set aside the Constitution which has been adopted by the people of the United States I say we do as bad and as vicious a thing as an anarchist society when it meets and resolves that it will disregard the Constitution. Let us read this joint resolution. It provides:

That until the adjournment sine die of the present session of the Congress no judicial order for the recovery of possession of any real estate, now or hereafter held acquired by oral or written lease, or for the ejectment or dispossession of a tenant therefrom, shall be made, and all leases thereof shall continue so long as the tenant continues to pay rent at the agreed rate—

It not only abrogates the terms of written contracts, but it proposes to make a new contract. You propose by this resolution to extend the terms of a contract, even though the parties themselves do not want it extended. You proceed to make a contract between private citizens by a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States. You undertake to sanction that under the rule of necessity. It was old Milton who said, when speaking of Satan, that he justified his course under the doctrine of necessity.

What are you going to do with the fifth amendment to the Constitution, which reads:

No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

What are you going to do with the provision that no State shall pass any law abrogating the terms of a contract, a doctrine which in principle applies to the Federal Government? What are you undertaking when you declare:

Provided, That any provision in any oral or written lease that the same shall be determined or forfeited if the premises shall be sold is hereby declared to be void while this resolution shall be in force, and every purchaser shall take the conveyance of any premises subject to the rights of all tenants in possession thereof under the provisions of this resolution—

Except to impair, annul, avoid, and cancel the terms of a contract?

What are you doing but simply sitting here in the Senate of the United States and resolving to violate the Constitution adopted by a sovereign people? For shame! For shame! Of course, Mr. President, there is no use in reading the old authors. The other day a bill was brought in here which proposed to try everybody in the United States by a court-martial. Many Senators had been talking to the effect that the Constitution was gone; that it was dead, or temporarily had been sealed up in the catacombs, along with other defunct things, and that it would there remain, only to be resurrected by the trumpets of restored peace when they once more reverberate in the capitals of the world. The President of the United States gave you a rude jolt when he called attention to the fact that the Constitution still lives and must be obeyed. Let me read a little from an old story—

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does not the Senator from Missouri think that the advocates of that measure received a rude jolt when they ascertained that the Senate would never pass such a bill?

Mr. REED. Well, I am glad if it be true that the Senate would not have passed it.

Mr. GALLINGER. That was pretty well demonstrated.

Mr. REED. I have a number of times seen the Senate line up with great gallantry on things it was "not going to do," and afterwards have seen it do them. The other day I found myself the only man on this side of the Chamber who "voted as he had talked."

I wish to call the attention of the Senate especially to this language of Judge Story:

The remaining clause, as to impairing the obligation of contracts, will require a more full and deliberate examination. The Federalist treats this subject in the following brief and general manner: "Bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts are contrary to the first principles—"

Let me call the attention of all the Members of the Senate to what old Story says:

Bills of attainder, ex post facto laws, and laws impairing the obligation of contracts, are contrary to the first principles of the social compact, and to every principle of sound legislation.

"Contrary to the first principles of the social compact!" Of course, that is true. They are learning that over in Russia now; they found it out over there when they began to disregard the rights of property, and ascertained speedily that they were starving; that their armies were dissolving like mist before the sun; that their land was beneath the feet of the conqueror; and that the proud nation of Russia was prostrate and enslaved. "Contrary to the first principles of the social compact!"

The two former—

That is, bills of attainder and ex post facto laws—

Are expressly prohibited by the declarations prefixed to some of the State constitutions, and all of them are prohibited by the spirit and scope of their fundamental character. Our own experience has taught us, nevertheless, that additional fences against these dangers ought not to be omitted. Very properly, therefore, have the convention added this constitutional bulwark in favor of personal security and private rights, etc. The sober people of America are weary of the fluctuating policy which has directed the public councils. They have seen, with regret and indignation, that sudden changes and legislative interferences in cases affecting personal rights became jobs in the hands of enterprising and influential speculators and sparses to the more industrious and less informed part of the community. They have seen, too, that one legislative interference—

Now, notice this—

They have seen, too, that one legislative interference is but the first link in a long chain of repetitions, every subsequent interference being naturally provoked by the effects of the preceding. They very rightly infer, therefore, that some thorough reform is wanting which will banish speculations on public measures, inspire a general prudence and industry, and give a regular course to business and society.

Such was the language of the Federalist at the time these great provisions of the Constitution were under consideration.

The fathers of the Republic knew that unless life, liberty, and property were secure, and that unless legislative interference with these great fundamental rights was prohibited, this Constitution and this Government would speedily disintegrate, and that the liberties of the people would ultimately fall beneath the assault of the foes of freedom; and so they ordained these safeguards. This afternoon we resolve to wipe them out.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator regard the law which we have passed, providing a moratorium for soldiers in case of debt, as in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I went over that bill and discussed it at the time it was under consideration.

Mr. KENYON. I have forgotten what position the Senator took.

Mr. REED. The position I took at that time was that the proposed law, as we had prepared it, was unconstitutional. I insisted in the committee and insisted on the floor of the Senate that we had a perfect right to protect the person of the soldier but that we did not have the right to stop the mere collection of a debt, and particularly the machinery of a State court. I contended for that as stoutly as I was able to contend.

But, Mr. President, that measure had some relation to the service of soldiers. It could be claimed, and probably will be claimed when the cases come to final arbitrament in the courts, that an interference even with the property of a soldier affects his utility as a soldier and, therefore, there is a direct connection, it may be argued, between the effect of this law upon a soldier and the conduct of the war; but this joint resolution does not even secrete itself behind any such pretense as that.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, anyone reading this joint resolution and thinking about it, is rather startled with its drastic provisions. I voted for it in the committee on a theory which I felt was analogous to that underlying the moratorium bill for soldiers; not that we are taking property, but we are merely suspending a remedy in behalf of persons who are engaged in governmental work and who consequently must not be disturbed. Now, I realize that it does go a trifle further than that, but that is the theory of the joint resolution.

Mr. REED. "A trifle further?" It goes the entire length. I beg my very good friend's pardon, but you can base the joint resolution on no such theory as that. The joint resolution applies to every man, woman, and child in the city of Washington who owns any property and rents it, and to every man, woman, and child in the city of Washington who rents any property.

Mr. KENYON. The bill itself covers only those connected with the Government; but I think that it is true that the joint resolution does go further than that.

Mr. REED. I am speaking of the joint resolution; I am not speaking of the bill. The joint resolution covers everything; nor is the joint resolution limited to the remedy. However, I remark that if we absolutely deny a man a remedy it is the denial of property. You can postpone a remedy for a reasonable time, but you can not deny a remedy. I read again from Story:

Although there is a distinction between the obligation of a contract and a remedy upon it, yet, if there are certain remedies existing at the time when it is made, all of which are afterwards wholly extinguished by new laws, so that there remain no means of enforcing its obligation and no redress, such an abolition of all remedies operating in present is also an impairing of the obligation of such contract.

And this operates in present. This joint resolution goes further than that. It undertakes to authorize a court to annul its solemn judgment even after the term of the court has expired in which the judgment was rendered and when the judgment was no longer within the bosom of the court.

Let me read:

That until the adjournment sine die of the present session of the Congress no judicial order for the recovery of possession of any real estate, now or hereafter held or acquired by oral or written lease, or for the ejectment or dispossession of a tenant therefrom, shall be made, and where such order has been made, but not executed before the passage of this resolution, the court by which the order was made may, if it is of the opinion that the order would not have been made if this resolution had been in force at the date of the making of the order, rescind or modify the order in such manner as the court may deem proper for the purpose of giving effect to this resolution.

What an appalling doctrine. Let us see. A year ago a court made an order terminating a lease and ordering the ouster of the tenant, to take place on to-morrow. The court's judgment has been duly recorded, has not been excepted to, and the term of court has expired. The order is about to be executed on to-morrow, whereupon the Congress of the United States, the tribunal that is appointed to guard the Constitution, passes a resolution under which the court can reconsider that case, set aside that solemn judgment, and render any judgment it sees fit.

I want to deal with all due respect with the committee, but I say that the bolsheviks in Russia have never adopted a resolution so utterly violative of every principle of civilized government as that. You can not point to such a resolution.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if this joint resolution were limited to those who are connected with the Government, would he not feel then that the principle was the same as that involved in the soldiers' moratorium legislation, although I know he does not believe that is constitutional and that is a fair matter for dispute?

Mr. REED. The Senator asks me, while I am on my feet, a question that anyone would naturally like to reflect upon for a moment before answering; but, answering in the off-hand way I am required to do, it strikes me that if this were limited to the right to occupy property by those who are actually in the Government service connected with the war, we might, in some measure, approximate the moratorium bill.

But the moratorium bill was defended by its sponsors upon an additional ground; they claimed that it only temporarily affected the remedy, and that even that affectation of the remedy was a matter discretionary with the judge; that is to say, they provided for a short stay of legal proceedings, during which time the defendant was to be notified and was to be represented in a certain way in court; and thereupon the judge had within his discretion the postponement of the proceedings or the postponement of execution. So an additional claim was made for the moratorium bill that it had about it those limitations to which I have referred.

Profiteering can be stopped without this sort of measure; at least it can be greatly limited. I have suggested a means which is not original with me. An excess-profits tax could be levied, and the excess profits could be determined by comparing the present rental with the rental of six months or a year ago, and the tax could be made so great as to take all the landlords unjustly extort.

I have spoken of this resolution rather harshly. Perhaps I ought not to do that; in these times we ought to be prepared for almost everything. New wrongs are springing up and men seek to remedy them, and I have no doubt the committee is acting in the best of faith; but I do beg Senators to remember that it is better even to endure temporary evils than it is to impair the respect for the Constitution. Only the other day we passed a law making it a criminal offense for a man to speak disrespectfully of the Constitution. To-day we propose to pass a resolution to ignore its more sacred terms. No nation ever won a great fight if its leaders lost their heads. These are times for calmness and deliberation, for coolness of action; we should not be precipitated into things.

Let me illustrate that. Some very enthusiastic gentlemen undertook to create by magic, overnight, a fleet of airplanes.

They told all the country how quickly they would have them, and they plunged into the work of constructing those airplanes before they understood the problem. The result is that to-day, in some parts of the airplane program, we are months behind where we would have been if a little time for calm deliberation had been taken and if plans had been made based upon facts and not upon enthusiasm.

Some gentlemen started in in the same way to get certain types of guns. They found a new gun which was going to revolutionize everything, and without sitting down in cold blood and analyzing the proposition and passing upon it on its merits they rushed into the making of contracts for a new type of gun; and yet the heavy gun of that type, which we were told we would have on hand at this time in the thousands, has progressed so little that we have not yet a single gun—not one—not even one to look at. The chart of production shows an interesting and a very sad column of zeros. It would have been better to have taken a little time and to have known what we were doing.

We started rushing soldiers into camps. I speak of this not in harshness; but we got a great many of them in camps before they could be uniformed and before they had guns. It would have been better to have been a little more deliberate and a little more careful. Perhaps two and one-half hours' careful study by one man would have saved the lives of hundreds of these boys.

We have constantly arising before us new difficulties in the legislative field. Most aggravating things occur. A lot of very cheap profiteers see a chance to graft by excessive rents and they start raising rents, and everybody gets mad, and we plunge into a so-called remedy, and yet you will find that you have no remedy. There is not a respectable court in the United States that would not spit upon this joint resolution.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I am very much in sympathy with the legal argument that is being made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. I want to call his attention, though, to this situation, which doubtless he has thought of, and to which our attention has been called by other Senators:

We have here a city, as the Senator stated a few moments ago, of approximately 350,000 inhabitants. The overwhelming number of those who are residing here have come from other parts of the Union. Many of them are young girls and young boys.

Mr. REED. Most of whom ought to be sent home.

Mr. KING. I am inclined to think that the Senator is right. Many of the young boys ought to be in the Army instead of being here seeking a Government job. However, they are here. They are dependent for their support upon the salaries which they receive from the Government. After paying the enormous prices required for food and for current expenses, a very small sum is left for them, out of which they have to pay their room rent. I have had at least 200 or 250 clerks speak to me within the past three or four weeks, complaining of the exorbitant rents that are being charged by the building owners of Washington; and quite a number of the young men and young women who have spoken to me have complained that after they had paid one month's rent or two month's rent, as the case may be, the rent was raised.

Only Saturday four spoke to me and said that the landlords demanded \$5 a month additional rent, starting with the 1st of next month, and would not consent to rent longer than 30 days, and they anticipated at the expiration of that month an additional raise, and so on; and two of the young men stated that they would leave their positions and return home, because they could not afford to pay these increased rents.

Mr. REED. Five dollars a month?

Mr. KING. That was for one room for one young man. That meant considerable to him. I do not mean to say that the \$5 a month was all the rent that he paid; it was an increase that was demanded, and he expected that an additional increase would be demanded for the next month, and so on indefinitely, because his landlord would make no promise as to when there would be a cessation in the demands.

Now, we have that problem here to meet. It is a serious one. This work in which the Government is interested must be done. Many of the young men and women who are here are necessary because of the needs of the Government. Senators have clerks and other employees here. They have to remain. They are necessary to the work which the Senators have to perform. Now, what can be done? What ought to be done? What have we the power to do in order to relieve this situation, because

there is no question in the world that there are men renting houses in this District who are selfish, who practice profiteering, and who would exact the last pound of flesh that they possibly could out of the poor people who are compelled to rent?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator had been in the Chamber he would have heard me early in my remarks answer the question. I say, first, that this joint resolution is not limited to Government employees, much less limited to those employed in occupations that have to do with the war. The joint resolution applies to every man, woman, and child in the District of Columbia who is a property holder and to every tenant. The joint resolution applies not only to the profiteer who has been doing the things to which the Senator refers, but it applies to the individual who has not raised his rent one penny, and who made, in good faith, a lease under which a tenant was to get out at a certain time; and you deprive him of the chance to use his property as he intended to use it, possibly to transform it into a different kind of building, possibly to have it as a home for a friend or a member of his family who is coming to the city. This joint resolution applies to all of them.

Second, as to the remedy: I have not the slightest doubt that the Congress of the United States, being the supreme legislative body within the District of Columbia, has the power to levy an excess-profits tax and so to phrase that tax law that any man who has raised his rents above what they were at this period last year shall begin to pay an excess-profits tax; and you can make it advance as rapidly as you please, and you can speedily bring it to point where, if the rents are raised very much, the entire excess will be taken over by the Government.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question, of course that plan can be adopted; but I am quite sure the Senator would agree with the members of the committee, if he had been present at the hearings, in their conclusion that there has been generally a very exorbitant increase in the rents charged to lessees in the District of Columbia. Now, what relief is it going to be to these tenants to have this excess-profits tax against the landlords or lessors? The purpose of this is twofold.

Mr. REED. I do not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. POMERENE. I tried to point out that there has been a very general and a very excessive increase of rents in the District of Columbia.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Missouri seeks to meet that by an excess-profits tax.

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. Now, that would grant some relief to the extent that it might discourage excessive rates; but with that exception it would grant no relief whatsoever to the tenant who has been overcharged.

Mr. REED. My answer to that is this: In the first place, I am inclined to think that some increase in some of the rents is justifiable.

Mr. POMERENE. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. REED. Secondly, I say this, and the figures I use now are purely for illustration: If the Government took half of the excess if a man went to 15 per cent, and if the Government took all of the excess if he went above that, there would be mighty little inducement for a landlord to charge above 15 per cent.

Of course, the figures I have used are purely illustrative. I do not mean to say that those are the correct places at which to put the limitation, but I am trying to suggest a legal means by which a result can be reached.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a further question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Is it possible that the Government might be deprived of all of its employees in the District and, to a large extent, the functions of the Government here cease while you were trying experiments with the taxing power on landlords to make them give Government employees an opportunity to live in the District of Columbia?

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, I do not think that question reaches the matter. If the Government were about to be deprived of all of its employees, there is a way in which even that could be reached, and that is by taking over the property for a public use, by commandeering and taking the property and paying for it. That would be a legal method; but you do not answer an insuperable constitutional objection by referring to the difficulties that may be in our way.

I know that it would be utterly useless to make the argument I have just made to a crowd upon the street corner, but it ought not to be useless here. I assert without the slightest fear of

being found to be a false prophet that if you pass this sort of joint resolution, the building that will take place in this town during the rest of this war will be Government building, and we will have to take the money out of the taxes of the people to build the houses, because no man in his senses will build once you assert the right of Congress to come in and fix the rent and the terms of the lease, because no man will know whether Congress will fix them on the basis of a reasonable return or not.

Whenever we allow ourselves to go before the world as having torn up all the old anchors and having destroyed the Constitution, as having, simply because we are incensed at the outrages and wrongs of some individual men, been willing to batter down the bulwarks of liberty which were painfully erected by the hands of the fathers which have been baptized with the blood and tears of thousands and which we have hoped and prayed may endure forever—whenever we go before the world with that sort of doctrine, money will go into hiding, and no man will invest it. But if you pass a law here that you have a right to pass, even though you may too much limit the profits according to the opinion of some gentlemen who may be interested, nevertheless you have recognized the rights of property and the security of property.

These things are not so bad as they are pictured. We read a few articles in the paper, and we get one or two letters, and we grow excited.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Just let me finish this sentence.

Now, where is the exodus of clerks from Washington? Where are these people who can not get homes? They are coming, coming, coming—as my friend, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] suggests—a hundred thousand strong. They are getting off the trains with their grips. If the recruits for the Army were coming as rapidly as the recruits for the departments there would not be any necessity for the new draft, for they would volunteer faster than we could build ships to take them over. It is utter nonsense to stand here and say that the Federal Government is to be paralyzed by these rent raisers. My friends ought not to make that argument, because it is not a sound argument. It is not an argument based on facts. Moreover, I venture the assertion that there are many thousands of landlords in this city who have not raised their rents a penny, and do not intend to.

I talked to a landlord who has a very fine apartment building not far from where my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] lives, or where he recently lived. He said to me that he had not raised his rents a penny; but he declared: "I have found that a considerable number of my tenants have sublet their premises at an advance of two and three and four hundred per cent. Some of them have gone out of the town to reside, and they are living off the profit; but," he said, "that will all terminate on the 1st day of October. I am writing in every new lease I make a clause that there shall be no subletting, and I am doing it for the first time in my life, because of the abuse of these subtenants."

I have no doubt that if the leading landlords of this city were called into a room by a committee of the Senate, or by a commission appointed by the President of the United States, and it were put up to them as a patriotic duty to keep their rents where they were a year ago, with perhaps a slight advance to make up for the additional cost of maintenance and keeping up property, the principal landlords of this city would sign an agreement of that kind to-morrow. The people of the country have shown that disposition most magnificently. The coal men of the United States got together and agreed on the price of coal. Somebody said it was too high and kicked it all over, and we have been producing less coal every day since they kicked it over, and we are paying substantially the prices now that were agreed upon then. There are ways to handle these matters without losing our heads over them.

I go back to what I said a while ago. I put it upon the conscience of Senators. We passed a law the other day—nearly everybody voted for it—that if any man spoke disrespectfully of the Constitution of the United States he could be sent to the penitentiary; and in this body, by solemn resolution, we propose to disregard its most sacred precepts. If we do that in this body, if we disregard the Constitution here, if we undertake to set ourselves up as above the Constitution, higher than the great fundamental law adopted by the people, if we run counter to these principles, which the writers of the Federalist said were a part of the social compact and could never be set aside, because they existed before constitutions were written and would exist when constitutions were dead and forgotten—if we do that here, what will you expect from the Industrial Worker of the World, steeped in ignorance and whisky? If we disregard the Consti-

tution, what do you expect him to do? If we disregard the rights of property, what do you expect of the fellow who is urged to drive a steel wedge into the end of a log to destroy a saw that is to cut it into timber? If we here in this Chamber set the example of a disregard of law and of Constitution, what can you expect from the base-born, the base-raised, the low of intellects, the ignorant, who follow on and on where shrewd criminals lead?

I know, as I stand and make these remarks, that somebody is likely to say that I am in favor of profiteers in Washington. I wish that every man in Washington who has played the hog could have his name printed where all men could read it for all time. I wish he could be branded as a man who speculated upon his country's necessities, who took advantage of the war in order that he might coin money out of the war. I should like to put his picture in contrast with that of the boy going over the trench and giving his life while this fellow grabs dollars from somebody at home. I hold such a man in a contempt that is inexpressible; but I hold this old Constitution in a respect that is unutterable, because it is the palladium of our rights, because when it is destroyed the night of anarchy will have settled upon this earth and civilization will have been lost within its shadows.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have listened with a good deal of edification to the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, and especially to his constantly repeated inquiry: "What are we to expect of the I. W. W.'s if we try to curb them?" My answer will be in asking another question: "What are we to expect from the I. W. W.'s if we do not expect to curb them?" And as a mere commentary upon the two questions I would suggest that the ordinary I. W. W. had better thank God that he is not shot; and I can not see why anybody should be tender about his so-called rights. I do not see that he has any. I never did conceive that either a murderer or a horse thief had any rights after you had convicted him of murder or of horse theft. These people have got to be convicted before they are punished.

I did not rise for that purpose, however, Mr. President, I rose for another purpose.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; of course.

Mr. REED. Did the Senator think I was talking about the I. W. W.'s and defending them? I was talking about a rent bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, but the Senator went on to say: "We are going to do this; we are going to violate the Constitution; we are going back upon the original federalistic principles that existed before the Constitution was adopted—the eternal principles, and so on; now, what will the I. W. W.'s do?"

Mr. REED. I understand the Senator's logic now.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My answer is that the I. W. W.'s would do just as much if we did not pass the legislation as they will if we do, and that they would do a good deal more.

But, Mr. President, I did not rise for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

BUREAU OF WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I submit a report from the Finance Committee favorable to the passage of the bill (S. 4482) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended, and I submit a report (No. 428) thereon. I request the publication of the report and of the appendix accompanying it, which consists of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Finance Committee that considered the two House bills of which Senate bill 4482 is a consolidation. I also ask that there be published the usual number of the hearings of the subcommittee, whatever it is, that is printed for the use of the Senate.

I ask that the report of the committee be published, and that the bill go to the calendar, and that a sufficient number of copies of the hearings before the subcommittee be published for the use of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to say that the hearings before the subcommittee were to be printed as a part of the committee report. Am I correct? There is no necessity of having a further number printed, is there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I do not know. How many copies of the report will be published under the usual order? I only want printed enough copies of the hearings for the use of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. There will be about 200.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, well, that is sufficient. Then I withdraw the request for a special publication of the hearings before the subcommittee, and just ask that the usual number of copies of the report, which contains the hearings, may be published.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be printed, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

RENTAL OF PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) to prevent rent profiteering in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I move to strike out the amendment adopted just a moment ago on the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and to insert in its place the matter which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], on page 2, line 2, after the word "landlord," where the words "or bona fide purchaser" were inserted, on page 2, line 4, after the word "Government," it is proposed to insert:

Or where the property has been disposed of to a bona fide purchaser for his own occupancy.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, this is substantially the same amendment, but it permits property to be sold to a person other than a Government employee. It might be that an individual owning property in the District of Columbia would find it necessary to sell his property to protect some interest, or perhaps in a case where a mortgage was being called, and he could not find a purchaser who was a Government employee, but he could find one who was not. It seems to me it would be very unfair if he was prevented from selling it and giving possession to a man who was not a Government employee.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I do not think there is any special objection to that amendment, except that it enlarges the cases of possible hardship. I ask that the amendment be again reported, so that I may be sure of the wording of it. I think it is all right, and I am perfectly willing to have the amendment accepted.

The Secretary again read the amendment.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am perfectly willing that the amendment shall be adopted. I ask for its adoption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is as in Committee of the Whole and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the joint resolution will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. REED. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Calder	Hollis	Saulsbury	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Sheppard	Thompson
Curtis	McCumber	Sherman	Tillman
Dillingham	New	Simmons	Trammell
France	Norris	Smith, Ga.	Underwood
Gallinger	Page	Smoot	
Gronna	Pomerene	Sutherland	
Henderson	Reed	Swanson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Twenty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. KING, Mr. McNARY, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. POINDEXTER, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina answered to their names when called.

Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. GERRY, Mr. BORAH, Mr. KENDRICK, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANDELL, and Mr. NELSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. RANDELL. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. GUION] on very important business, which necessarily called him away.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], is absent on account of illness.

Mr. SHAFROTH entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is no quorum present.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 7, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, May 6, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the ages, Infinite Spirit, whose brooding love is over all, in us all, through us all; unheralded, yet pronounced; unseen, yet known; unheard, yet felt; the inspiration of all that is purest, noblest, best in man. It binds us together into families, where all the sweetest and purest affections have their sway; unites men into nations; makes patriots, statesmen, and loyal citizens; builds churches the centers from which radiate charity, philanthropy, schools, and colleges; makes the whole world akin; promises the final brotherhood of all peoples; and now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love, the crown of all humanity.

No one is so accursed by fate,
No one so utterly desolate,
But some heart, though unknown,
Responds unto his own.
Responds, as if with unseen wings,
An angel touched its quivering strings;
And whispers, in its song,
"Where hast thou stayed so long!"

Hasten the day when love shall have its sway; wars cease; hate, revenge, jealousies, and unholy strife give way to its warm and penetrating rays; through Him who revealeth its power in an heroic sacrifice for all mankind. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 4, 1918, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record a speech made in my district, at Jacksontown, Mo., on Liberty Loan Day by Hon. XENOPHON P. WILEY, who since that time has been appointed by the governor of Missouri to the United States Senate. At that time it was not known by him or anyone else that three days later he would be appointed to the Senate, but this address did him great credit as a private citizen, and equally so now as a United States Senator.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting therein a speech made by Senator WILEY, of Missouri. Is there objection?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I will inquire of the gentleman from Missouri whether Mr. WILEY has yet taken the oath of office as Senator?

Mr. RUSSELL. He has not taken the oath as yet, but he is expected to take it to-day. He is expected to be here at 1 o'clock.

Mr. DYER. I have no objection to the insertion of the speech, and I would be glad to see it in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein a speech delivered by our distinguished colleague, Dr. FESS, at Hartford, Conn., on Sunday, March 17, 1918, on the subject of the war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOOD PRODUCTION.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, I report herewith the war-emergency appropriation bill (H. R. 11945, H. Rept. No. 535), making appropriations to carry on the work required by the food-production act for the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves all points of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. GARNER. I renew the reservation.

The SPEAKER. The bill is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8753) to amend section 3,

title 1, of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On April 29, 1918:

S. 3476. An act to authorize the extension of a spur track or siding from the existing lines of railroad in the District of Columbia across First Street NE., between L and M Streets, to the buildings occupied by the field medical supply depot of the Army.
On May 6, 1918:

H. R. 10613. An act to provide for the collection and disposal of garbage and miscellaneous refuse of the District of Columbia.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration at this time the bill H. R. 9959, increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the bill H. R. 9959, a pension bill. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have the bill reported first.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of pension of any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and was honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now in receipt of a pension or shall hereafter be granted a pension under the provisions of any general law, or is now pensioned under a special act of Congress, and who is entitled to a pension less than \$25 per month, shall be \$25 per month.

In case such person has reached the age of 70 years and served one year, the rate of pension shall be \$26 per month; one and one-half years, \$28 per month; two years, \$30 per month; two and one-half years, \$31 per month; three years or over, \$32.50 per month.

In case such person has reached the age of 75 years and served 90 days, \$27 per month; six months, \$29 per month; one year, \$31 per month; one and one-half years, \$35 per month; two years or over, \$39 per month.

That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty, resulting in his disability, is now unable to perform manual labor, shall be paid the rate of \$39 per month, without regard to the length of service or age.

Sec. 2. That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and who was honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now pensioned or shall hereafter be pensioned under any general law, or who is now pensioned under special act of Congress at a rate of \$20 per month or more, shall be entitled upon the passage of this act to receive in lieu thereof a rate which shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, in multiples of 50 cents, nearest approximating 30 per cent additional to the present rate: *Provided*, That no rate of pension shall be granted under the provisions of this act in excess of \$50 per month: *Provided further*, That no pension heretofore granted shall be reduced by this act.

Sec. 3. That no pensioner shall be entitled to receive any benefits under the provisions of this act for any period during which he shall be an inmate of any State or national soldiers' home; and the provisions of this act shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more.

Sec. 4. That the increased rates of pension provided by this act shall commence from the date of the approval of said act, or, in case of original pensions hereafter allowed, from the date of commencement of such pensions as provided by existing laws.

Sec. 5. That no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fees shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is this bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

The SPEAKER. It is not on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then I object.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GILLET. Although it would not be in order to-day, yet to-morrow, it being a privileged bill, if the Speaker should recognize the gentleman from Ohio he could bring it up by motion, could he not?

The SPEAKER. Yes. There are several ways to bring it up.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, this being also suspension day, if the gentleman from Ohio should move to suspend the rules and pass the bill and two-thirds should vote for it it would pass, would it not?

The SPEAKER. It would, undoubtedly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is the motion to take it up as a privileged matter now in order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This is unanimous-consent day.

Mr. LANGLEY. But it is a privileged bill?

The SPEAKER. That does not prevent it being considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. LANGLEY. I know; but unanimous consent has been objected to, and my inquiry is whether or not the gentleman from Ohio could not make the motion to take it up now.

The SPEAKER. It has already been objected to.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GILLET. If it should be brought up by unanimous consent, it would not be subject to amendment, but if it was brought up to-morrow in the regular order, it would be subject to amendment, would it not?

The SPEAKER. If it is brought up by unanimous consent it is subject to amendment.

Mr. GILLET. If it is brought up by motion to-morrow, it would be subject to amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes, it would; and it would if unanimous consent were given to consider it now.

Mr. GILLET. But if brought up under suspension of the rules it would not?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he will not ask for unanimous consent to consider this bill to-morrow immediately after the reading of the Journal in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CANNON. And if unanimous consent is given, why the bill could be speedily disposed of.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois I am instructed by the committee of which I am chairman to ask unanimous consent for this bill. I shall have to consult with the committee. As far as I am individually concerned, I would be willing to make that motion. This bill has been on the calendar since the 27th of February, over two months, and in the meantime 6,250 have died. I am anxious to get this bill up for consideration at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent—

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. If the gentleman from Ohio should move now to suspend the rules and two-thirds should vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill, it would pass the House, would it not?

The SPEAKER. If it got two-thirds, it would.

Mr. GARNER. Why will not the gentleman move to suspend the rules?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will move to suspend the rules and pass this bill.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. If the House should follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas and pass the bill under suspension of the rules, there would not be any opportunity to amend the bill, would there?

The SPEAKER. The Chair just stated that. The matter voted on when a motion is made to suspend the rules is what is read from the Clerk's desk, and you could not amend it except by unanimous consent.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I hope under those circumstances—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the request of the gentleman from Ohio to suspend the rules and pass this bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. I desire to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he will yield to me for a question?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. Regular order is that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] moves to suspend the rules and pass this bill. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] demands a second.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Would it be in order now to ask unanimous consent to have an hour's debate on a side, on account of the importance of this bill?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. LANGLEY. I have a right to ask the question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts agree that the second be considered as ordered?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has 20 minutes and the gentleman on the other side—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman from Ohio moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] demanded a second?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman from Ohio asked unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Now, was that done?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts agreed to it.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the whole House has a say about it.

Mr. LANGLEY. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. There is no question as to what the House thinks about. The gentleman from Massachusetts agreed that a second be considered as ordered, and the gentleman from Ohio has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Massachusetts 20 minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the control of that time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], the ranking minority member on the committee.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RUCKER. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. I desire to know if after the 40 minutes' time has been consumed there will be any opportunity to discuss this bill?

The SPEAKER. There will not, unless the House gives unanimous consent.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I shall not occupy very much time on this bill. This bill has been very carefully considered by the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and this is a unanimous report of that committee. The whole question of pensions has been thoroughly discussed for about half a century. Latterly, since the act known as the Sherwood dollar-a-day pension bill was enacted, on the 11th day of May, 1912, the question of system and the basic construction of pensions has been thoroughly settled. This bill disturbs no existing order. It places pensions upon the basis which was adopted on the 11th of May, 1912. The Grand Army of the Republic, which represents about 45 per cent of all of the surviving soldiers of this war, at an encampment which met at Boston last year appointed a legislative committee to have charge of all pension legislation demanded by the Grand Army of the Republic. I was not present at that encampment, but the soldiers of that encampment made me a member of that legislative committee. The legislative committee met in the city of Washington recently before this bill was prepared, and I met with that committee, and this bill was prepared in harmony with recommendations of that committee. This bill carries at present, according to the best estimates—or will carry, if enacted into law by the 1st of July, 1918—just about \$21,000,000. Now, there are so many Members who have asked for time on this question, and it is so well understood, that I will not occupy any more of the time of the House.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this bill now before the House meets with the approval of the Grand Army of the Republic?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Well, I have had about 800 letters on the bill, and I have received resolutions adopted by the Grand Army of the Republic in favor of the bill from Ohio to Oregon. Two of these were from the largest Grand Army posts in Ohio—one the Forsyth, of Toledo, and the other an indorsing letter from McKinley Post, of Canton. Here is the resolution that was adopted unanimously after full debate by the Forsyth Post, of

Toledo, Ohio. And I want to say further, that I never sent a letter to a soldier, and no propaganda has been carried on in favor of this bill. Whatever has been done has been voluntary. Let me read the resolution of Forsyth Post, Grand Army of the Republic. It is as follows:

TOLEDO, OHIO, February 25, 1918.

Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A copy of your recent pension bill was presented to the post at our stated meeting on February 19, 1918, by Camrade Willard Van Wormer, and by verbal resolution the post heartily indorsed its provisions and trust that it may receive the support that it merits and become a law. Thanking you for your past and continued efforts in behalf of the old soldier of 1861 to 1865.

I was instructed by the post to convey to you the above information.

Yours, in F., C., and L.,

J. W. BROWNSBERGER,
Adjutant of Forsyth Post, No. 15,
Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio.

Mr. DYER. Do I understand the legislative committee which represents the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic approves of the bill? That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It is my understanding that a majority of the committee approves it.

Mr. DYER. The commander in chief also?

Mr. SHERWOOD. The chairman of the committee, Mr. Washington Gardner, said we ought to put in a resolution asking for \$40,000,000 as a sort of something to aim at, and I agreed to it.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to a question?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand it, whoever of these soldiers has \$1,000 a year income does not get the advantage of the provisions of this bill?

Mr. SHERWOOD. No, sir; he does not.

Mr. CANNON. Then, as I understand, all the 19,000 people who are in the soldiers' homes are excluded?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Twenty-three thousand.

Mr. CANNON. I do not believe there are that many. There are 19,000, I think, of the Union soldiers in them.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It is 23,000, according to the report of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CANNON. Well, whether it is 19,000 or 23,000, they do not get the advantage of this bill while they are in the soldiers' homes?

Mr. SHERWOOD. No, sir; they do not; and I will tell you the reason why. This is an emergency measure. They are all drawing liberal pensions now. Formerly, when a similar bill passed, it cost the Government \$240 a year for every soldier in the soldiers' homes, and now it costs \$400, and if you include these soldiers you will give the inmates of the soldiers' homes \$400 more in pensions and support than those outside.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a single remark in his time? I am going to vote for this bill under suspension of the rules. It is better than no bill a good deal, but I think it does an injustice to the men who are receiving \$1,000 income and to the men in the soldiers' homes, and I think the bill ought to be amended. That is all I want to say. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to know if it would be in order to ask unanimous consent to double the time on each side?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. Let me say that this is an important matter, and many of us want to talk on it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the time may be extended so that each side will have 40 minutes of debate.

Mr. SHERWOOD. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 20 minutes a side, so that instead of having 20 minutes on a side each side will have 40 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RUCKER. Will it be in order to move—

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] withdraws his objection. Is there objection to the length of time for this debate being doubled, on the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLAND. Now, I think I had three minutes, granted to me by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], and I would like to ask him if he would make it six minutes now?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there are a half dozen men in this House that would say that this measure meets with their approval, and it seems strange to me that the House finds itself in a position where it can not have the opportunity of amending the bill it is now considering so as to meet the approval of the House. Most of you gentlemen have slobbered over the old soldier in your districts at home; have told him how anxious you were to vote for a dollar-a-day pension. Why, indeed, some six years ago I was running for Congress against a Member who sat on that side of the House, and he rose at a soldiers' reunion and said, "Let me read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When I was in Congress, not long ago, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that I rose in my seat and the Speaker said, 'For what purpose does the gentleman rise?' and I said, 'I rise to amend the appropriation bill by adding on a dollar a day for the old soldiers.' And," he said, "Gentlemen, what do you think JOE CANNON said to me—your Representative. Why, JOE CANNON said, 'You are out of order,' and I had to sit down."

You do not have to be out of order if you gentlemen are sincere on that side of the House about getting the proper kind of a pension bill reported here. The able gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] last Saturday during the discussion we had on pension matters pointed out clearly and unmistakably how this bill could be considered. We adjourned at 4 o'clock last Saturday afternoon, when it would have been clearly in order for the chairman of the Invalid Pensions Committee to have obtained recognition for the purpose of moving consideration of this bill as privileged. The gentleman from Connecticut put it squarely up to that side of the House then and you adjourned. And I want to say to you that the fact that you are bringing it up this morning on suspension day shows you are not in sympathy with giving the soldier that to which he is entitled. I do not think the Speaker would deny the right of bringing this bill up here as a privileged matter. It has as high privilege as any bill has before this House to-day, and, under the rules of the House, if the chairman of this committee should on any other day except when higher privileged matters are being considered rise and ask that the bill be considered it could be considered, and then you gentlemen would have the opportunity of offering an amendment to give the dollar a day that you have been promising the old soldier all the time. I am looking into the faces of men on this side of the Chamber who have bills introduced for "dollar-a-day" pensions, and yet you sit still and permit this kind of an affair to be pulled off and bring this bill up under the suspension of the rules and run it over us fellows and make us swallow whole a bill that does not answer the requirements of a pension bill at this time. Of course I will vote for it, for it is all you are going to give us and it provides for an increase, which will help some.

Now, gentlemen, what does this bill contain? It provides for a \$25 minimum, the same amount the widows are getting to-day. It provides for a 30 per cent increase, a mere bagatelle, where a man is old and is totally incapable of performing manual labor. It also provides for no increase for a soldier with an income of \$1,000 including his pension, and if he is in a soldiers' home he can not get the increase.

As I remember, the chairman of the committee stated that the legislative committee of the Grand Army of the Republic was in favor of this bill. I have in my possession, and I will insert in the Record here, if you ask it, letters from the National Grand Army of the Republic officers, which will show that they positively oppose this bill and are for the provisions which are contained in my separate report, which is a copy of the Smoot bill in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. BLAND. The amendment I proposed to offer to the bill includes the provision of the Smoot bill, which provides for a \$30 minimum and a \$40 maximum, graduated between these amounts in accordance with age and service, and not affecting pensions of soldiers who get more than \$40 per month. That is the kind of bill you would get if you permitted that amendment, and that is why you are bringing this bill up under suspension of the rules. That shows the insincerity of that side of the House on the pension question. Some of you are gritting your teeth about it, and some Members of this House on your side do not like the way this bill has come up. Some of you are in favor of giving the soldier more money than the bill provides for. You ought to have the nerve to get up in your places and say so.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give me some resolution passed by some Grand Army post against the bill?

Mr. BLAND. I will give you plenty of letters in favor of the Smoot bill and my proposed bill, and I will give you strong letters against this bill, which I think you admit yourself is not satisfactory.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Can the gentleman give me any resolution passed by any Grand Army post against this bill? That is the question. Has the gentleman any such resolution?

Mr. BLAND. I have such resolutions in favor of the other bill—the Smoot bill. I have a communication from the National Commander of the Grand Army saying that they are for the Smoot bill, and that is what this House would have passed if the gallant chairman of the committee had been granted permission to call this bill up as privileged when he asked for that privilege.

Mr. SHERWOOD. He is not a member of the legislative committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill, as I indicated when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] was kind enough to yield to me to ask him a question. I believe that a bill of this kind ought to have been considered in the House with opportunity for amendment. If so, I believe it would have been amended in at least two particulars. I believe the \$1,000 proposition would have been cut out, and I believe that the men in the soldiers' homes—19,000 or 23,000 of them, as the case may be—would be entitled to the benefits of the bill.

The men in the Army that preserved the Union received all the way from \$13 to \$15 a month. The men—privates—in the present great world's contest receive \$30 a month, and one-half, or \$15 more, for the dependent wife and from \$5 to \$8 more to the children. In addition to that, they get insurance at the rate of \$8 per thousand. Now, then, I am glad of it. We all voted for it. But let us recollect one thing, that there are less than, say, 300,000 men now surviving of that Grand Army of 2,200,000 men that saved this Union. It was their force. They are now in their old age. We are spending money by the many billions. Dying, as they are, by multiplied thousands, it seems to me that it is good politics for all the people, Democrats and Republicans, men in the Army and in the Navy in this great war, from the sentimental standpoint as well as the just standpoint, that these people should not be cut out of this pension bill, and it ought to be amended. That is all I want to say. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield back any time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by my colleague from Ohio in charge of the time to yield time on this side. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has just taken his seat. He presents humane reasons, just reasons, for increasing the pension of the soldiers.

I can not agree with the views expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND]. Indeed, I think the gentleman has betrayed his ignorance—and I do not use the word offensively—his want of knowledge, of pension legislation. The gentleman stands here in the presence of a distinguished and gallant old Federal soldier, the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, as true a friend as those composing the Grand Army ever had [applause], and challenges the good faith of that gentleman because he asks for the passage of this bill under suspension of the rules. He alleges insincerity on the part of Members on this side of the House.

Does the gentleman recall that the Sulloway bill, which provided the highest rates of pension that any bill ever had provided up to that time, was passed in this body by Democratic votes, was sent to a Republican Senate, and there met its death in the arms of its supposed friends—the Senate, with a big Republican majority? Why did not the Senate pass the Sulloway bill? Let the gentleman from Indiana answer. Then following the defeat of the Sulloway bill by a Republican Senate

does not the gentleman recall the fact that soon after Democrats came into power in the House this old chieftain, who gallantly and bravely followed the flag for four years, Gen. SHERWOOD, brought in the Sherwood pension bill, under which to-day millions of homes are made happy, because that Democratic pension bill—the Sherwood bill—provides the highest rates of pension ever paid to soldiers in America? Again, does not the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] know that the Sulloway bill was passed in the House on a motion, made by a Republican, to suspend rules, just as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] is seeking to do now?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes. But make your question short. I have not the time nor inclination to submit to cross-examination.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman made a statement which I think it is incumbent upon me to qualify. It is true that that bill—the Sulloway bill—went to the Senate, but it is also true that it was objected to by Democratic Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman's party was in power in the Senate and had the votes to pass the bill regardless of Democratic opposition if it had so desired. Let me say in regard to the widows of old soldiers, the mothers of the boys who are to-day fighting on the firing line in France, that they were taken care of not by Republican action, but by Democratic action, and it remained for my Democratic friend from Ohio, Mr. ASHBROOK, to bring in the best, because the most liberal, bill ever passed granting pensions to widows.

Mr. BLAND. Who does the gentleman think should be entitled to the most credit for the last widows' increase?

Mr. RUCKER. I do not think the amendment the gentleman refers to should have passed in the form it did. It is discriminatory and unfair, as most all things are which are done by Republicans. Nobody should get credit for it. Everybody responsible for it should be blamed. If it had included other meritorious classes of widows I would gladly give it my approval. Let us get rid of this rubbish.

The gentleman from Indiana ought to revise his knowledge of pension legislation before he assaults on the floor of this House one of the best friends the soldier ever had, Mr. SHERWOOD, or the Democratic Party, which has done more for the veterans of our wars than the Republican Party ever did. But I am not advocating the passage of this bill under suspension of rules. The bill ought to be amended, and as it can not be amended under this motion to suspend the rules I am going to vote against it. If the pending motion is voted down, the bill can again be called up, as it is privileged, and then we will have opportunity to at least consider amendments. Unlike my friend from Indiana, I am not seeking votes. I am seeking only to discharge my duty as I see it. I will not vote for the motion to pass, under suspension, this bill in its present form, and I will tell you why. No one will seriously question my fidelity to the soldier, his widow or dependents. I do not object to increasing the pensions of soldiers where an increase is justified or merited, but I do object to passing this measure without the privilege of offering amendments, because there are some things in the bill that are radically wrong. [Applause.]

When I tell you the provisions I object to my Republican friends probably will not applaud, because I think the gentleman who applauded never applauds anything which is really right. [Laughter.] I object to the pending bill for this reason: Under it and as it is written about \$1,000,000 will be taken in the form of taxation from the people of the United States, in addition to all the great burdens that have already been placed upon them, and will be sent to foreign lands to pay increase of pensions to men who have not gazed on the Stars and Stripes, many of them, in 25 years—probably not in 50 years.

Not only that, but some five or six hundred men living in Germany and Austria-Hungary, where our boys are to-day being slain on the battle line, will draw increased pensions if this bill passes. Those who prefer to live in a country which has insulted the dignity of our flag, murdered our citizens, destroyed our commerce, and challenged the sovereignty of this great Republic would be beneficiaries under this act. I, for one, speaking for myself alone, will never vote to tax an American citizen to pay more money into the coffers of people who have turned their backs upon America and who prefer to live in Germany or Austria-Hungary. I will not vote for this bill for these reasons, and I give notice now that when the general pension appropriation bill comes before the House I will offer amendments which, if agreed to, will cut every foreigner off our pension rolls. I have stopped voting to tax American citizens to pay pensions to foreigners.

Let me say to my Republican friends, who always profess love for the soldier, when you had opportunity and power to really

prove your friendship for the soldier you never brought in such a bill as this. Why, when my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was Speaker of this House—and everybody knows his will was the supreme law, and it, perhaps, ought to have been, because he is the best man among you and knows more than all of you, and I speak with great respect for him—you did not do then what we have done since. It was not until there was a Democrat in the Speaker's chair and a Democratic majority in the House that the initiative was taken, the one long step which brought joy and relief to the soldiers of our land. I repeat, nobody questions my friendship for the soldier. I have done as much work for the worthy old soldiers in my district as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] has done for those in his district. I have visited every home in my entire district where affliction abides, where poverty dwells, where pain is felt. I have gone into the homes of these old soldiers and I have come back to Washington impressed with a sense of my duty, and I have enjoyed the pleasure of casting a little sunshine across the threshold of many a soldier's home, and I am proud to boast of it. But before I vote for this bill I claim the right to amend it, or at least to take the judgment of this House as to whether we shall tax our people to-day, in addition to the many billions we are now putting upon them, to send money into Germany to pay people who are more enamored of German kultur than they are of the glorious liberty guaranteed to all by that flag and the blessing of world democracy for which our boys are at this moment making the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. GALLIVAN, Mr. DYER, and Mr. BLAND rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. RUCKER. I yield first to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN], and then I will yield to the others.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Does the gentleman think any money is going to any pensioner in Germany at this time?

Mr. RUCKER. Oh, no; its transmission is suspended temporarily, but you enact this bill into law, and as soon as we lick the devil out of the Kaiser American money will go to Germany again, and you know it, and I, for one, am not in favor of its going now or hereafter.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleague what his judgment is with reference to sections 3 and 4 of the bill—whether he thinks they are good legislation?

Mr. RUCKER. Section 3 is the one I am talking about.

Mr. DYER. Section 3 is the section which provides that no pensioner shall receive any benefits under this act if his net income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more per annum.

Mr. RUCKER. I have an amendment which I hoped to offer and put into this bill which provides for a minimum income of \$1,200 instead of \$1,000, as written in the bill. I think \$1,200 is low enough.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman knows he can not amend this bill.

Mr. GALLIVAN. You can by unanimous consent.

Mr. RUCKER. But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] knows we can not get unanimous consent.

Mr. BLAND. Is the gentleman going to vote not to give the old soldiers in his district whom he has visited the benefit of this increase simply because he can not get what he wants?

Mr. RUCKER. No; the gentleman knows that is not my attitude.

Mr. BLAND. That will be the result, will it not?

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman knows that I will exercise my right as a Member of the House to introduce a bill and have it referred to the committee of which this gallant old warrior [Gen. SHERWOOD] is chairman, and that committee will report it out if found to be meritorious. I will introduce bills for every meritorious soldier or widow in my district, and that committee will report those bills to the House and they will pass. I will take care of the old soldiers in my district.

Mr. BLAND. Then the gentleman relies upon special bills to take care of those in his district?

Mr. RUCKER. I want to take care of every one who needs taking care of, because that is right; but it seems the gentleman wants to take care of those who vote, because he may need votes. I do not care a fig whether they vote or not. I am for all soldiers and widows who need help, whether they vote or do not vote.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I am sure the gentleman does not want to leave the impression that this bill carries any new legislation that would provide for the payment of pensions to those who are citizens of a country which is now at enmity with us.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not want to create the impression that the pending bill carries any new law in that respect, but I do want to leave the impression that it increases the rates of pension allowed to them under existing law. Is there any question about that?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It increases the rate of pension which they are drawing under present law.

Mr. RUCKER. Yes; it proposes to increase the pensions which foreigners are drawing under present law, and that is what I am opposed to. I am opposed to increasing the pensions of foreigners one penny. If I had my way about it I would never again take one single dollar out of the Federal Treasury to pay pension to any man who has established his home in a foreign land. [Applause.] Gentlemen can make what they please out of that. Our people who continue to rally around the flag have to pay the taxes, and those who have lost their love for this country, its sublime privileges, its matchless blessings, and its glory, should learn to depend upon the bounty of that Government they find most congenial to them.

If this bill was being considered under the ordinary rules of the House, I would offer the following as a substitute for section 3:

SEC. 3. That no pensioner shall be paid the increase of pension herein authorized for any period during which he shall be an inmate of a State or National home for soldiers, nor shall the provisions of this act apply to any pensioner whose net annual income, including the pension he now receives, is \$1,200 or more, nor to any pensioner not engaged in the service of the United States who has for five consecutive years last past resided beyond the limits of the United States and its possessions.

Mr. REED rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. RUCKER. I had yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman's time is rather limited, so I will give way in favor of the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. REED. What percentage of our pension money goes to nonresidents of the United States?

Mr. RUCKER. Roughly speaking I would say about \$1,000,000 out of about \$140,000,000.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. At the conclusion of the discussion on this bill I want to ask if under the rules of the House it would be proper to move to recommit with instructions to amend?

The SPEAKER. The motion to suspend the rules is a very peculiar one. There are half a dozen motions which do not apply to it, and the motion to recommit is one of them.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the debate I be allowed to make a motion to strike out section 3.

The SPEAKER. Of course, by unanimous consent anything can be done.

Mr. MAPES. I submit that request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that he be permitted at the end of the discussion to make a motion to strike out section 3. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the proper time I may make a motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object, Mr. Speaker, and I demand the regular order.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. Debate has not yet expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from Ohio control the time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to ask two questions of somebody who knows something about the matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to propound two questions to somebody who knows something about the bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is a committee bill, and it has been reported unanimously from the committee, except that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] presents minority views. The bill does not represent the wishes of some members of the committee. It was passed by a majority vote

of the committee and has been reported here now, and the only question is whether we are going to do anything for the relief of the old soldiers by way of increasing pensions on account of the greatly increased cost of living. That is what this bill is for. To-day we are either going to pass this bill or nothing will pass the House.

Of course the bill must go to the Senate. After the Senate has acted on it it will undoubtedly go to a conference committee, and the bill that finally becomes a law, if any, will be the bill reported from the conference committee. I am myself opposed to section 3, putting a limitation on the increase going to those who have an income of a thousand dollars and those who may have been compelled to seek refuge in a soldiers' home. I would like to see those two provisions eliminated from the bill before it becomes a law.

I am also in favor of the dollar-a-day pension for every old soldier who served his term of enlistment and received an honorable discharge. I think the minimum ought to be \$30, and when the bill comes back from the Senate and from the conference committee I hope that the minimum will be placed at \$30 and that section 3 will be eliminated from the bill. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, of course, as this bill now comes up under motion to suspend the rules, it is impossible to have any amendments considered at this time. I am therefore decidedly in favor of passing the bill now, as it is, and leave the question of amendment to the Senate. If it were in order I would offer or support an amendment to make the minimum pension \$30 per month and to strike out the provision denying the increase to those who may happen to have an income of \$1,000 and to those who may be any part of the time in a soldiers' home, and this for the reason that such provision would require proof to be made in every case, and thus cause delay and hardship to every old soldier who would be entitled to the increase. In my opinion the extra work entailed on the Pension Bureau and the extra cost would far exceed the amount saved to the Government by reason of those provisions. Even a more serious objection is the delay that would be caused in adjudicating the many cases that would be presented to the bureau. Most of the old soldiers need this increase, and need it now. The law should operate immediately and automatically, without the necessity of making any new proofs, so that the increase granted would be received in the lifetime of the beneficiaries. Under this bill as it is presented here thousands otherwise entitled will have passed away before the new proofs required could be completed and their claims passed upon by the pension officials. So I hope that when the bill comes back from the Senate it will not contain the provisions to which most of us are opposed. What relief we give to the old heroes of the Civil War should be given now, with no strings attached. In these days of stress and trial it is fitting that we should deal justly and generously with the still surviving soldiers of a former generation, who gave or offered all they had for their and our country. We are now engaged in another great war, the greatest and most fearful of all time. As we deal with the country's defenders of the past, so may the young heroes of to-day know that they will ever be held in grateful remembrance by a free and liberty-loving people, who will back them, if need be, with the last dollar while they are fighting the battles of humanity, and for all time in the future.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that there is any appearance, even, of partisanship in the determination of this question. I think I have the right to say, as the gentleman from Missouri has said, that it is a matter to be regretted that this bill comes before us under such circumstances as prevent its amendment. It could have easily been presented so that it would receive full consideration of the House and give the Members an opportunity to express their real views in regard to the matter. I believe personally that the amounts contained in the bill are too small. I think there are two or three provisions in the bill that are unfair and unjust.

I concur in the criticism of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] on this bill. I think there are other criticisms, but I am certainly so strongly in favor of increase in pensions and so anxious that it shall be brought about as quickly as possible that I can not take the responsibility of voting against the bill. I shall vote for it, regretting the fact that it does not more nearly express the real ideas and views of the membership of this House. I regret that it comes before us under the circumstances that will prevent amendments being offered.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Is it not a fact that your party caucused on this bill?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Does not the gentleman think that that would have something to do in creating the bitterness and feeling along that line?

Mr. TOWNER. I will say that it might. I am not now voicing any reproaches as to anybody regarding anything that has been done. I am expressing my personal regret at the circumstances under which this bill is presented. I can not believe that the gentleman from Ohio would, for the purpose of recrimination, do an unjust act in this body by putting the bill through without an opportunity for amendment. I do not believe it fair or just that the bill should be put through under suspension of the rules so as to prevent amendment and allow an opportunity for the House to express its real sentiments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY] a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, the time has been equally divided between the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Kentucky. Let the gentleman from Indiana get his time from one of those gentlemen. I object and will continue to object to any such request.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for these three minutes primarily for the purpose of putting a question to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], in charge of the time on the Democratic side. Would this bill, if enacted into law, result in the payment of increased pensions to any citizen of Bulgaria, Germany, Austria-Hungary, or Turkey?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I think without doubt it would increase the pensions of all soldiers alike, but their pensions are held up pending this war. At the conclusion of the war I presume they would be entitled to receive the increase.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But if we do not pass this bill the Union soldiers who are now residents of Ireland or England or France would also have their increases held up?

Mr. COX. Oh, no; they are getting their pensions right along to-day.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But their increases would be held up?

Mr. COX. No.

Mr. ASHBROOK. No.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Gentlemen can see why I have asked the question. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to what the defeat of the bill would mean.

Mr. COX. Mr. Saltzgeber before the committee said that all foreign soldiers were getting pensions except those living in Germany and Austria.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; but this bill provides, in effect, for increases for all of them except those living in enemy countries, and therefore if the bill should be defeated the Union veterans now living in England, France, or Ireland—

Mr. ASHBROOK. Or the United States.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Or the United States, would not receive increased pensions.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is true.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Therefore, I am going to vote for the bill, because, in my judgment, any man not now an enemy of the United States or living in an enemy country, who in the awful years of 1861 to 1865 risked his life to help save this Republic is entitled to everything that can possibly be given him, in justice, from the Treasury of the United States. [Applause.] But the gentleman from Missouri, Judge RUCKER, in criticizing the bill, declared that he is not willing to pay pensions to men now living in other countries, men who, as he said, "do not live under that flag." And yet I presume that in the dark days of 1861 to 1865 the gentleman was entirely willing that those soldiers should go out under that flag to protect him and to save from destruction the country of which he is now a citizen. He did not, at that time, say to those brave men, "Before you go forth to fight we want to know whether you are always going to live here, because if you are not always going to live here when we come to pension the saviors of the Nation we will omit you."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, in the years to come I am sure I will look back upon my service in this House and rejoice over the fact that I have never lost an opportunity to favor by speech and vote every measure in the interest of the Union soldiers and the widows of those who have passed away. It has always been a labor of love with me to aid by legislation the brave men who preserved this great Republic, the envy and admiration of all the rest of the world. While our new soldiers are now on the soil of our sister Republic of France, fighting to make the world safe from German military conquest and misrule it is well for us here in Congress to pause long enough to honor and do justice to those in our midst who fought and suffered on the battle fields that the American Union should not perish and that the blessings of liberty, justice, and equality should be handed down to us and our posterity. This is the richest and most prosperous country in all the world; its resources and wealth unequalled. This has been made a reality by the courage, sacrifices, and lives of the Union soldiers led to victory by Grant, Sherman, and Thomas on land and by our naval commanders, Farragut and Porter. This Nation has never paid in full and can not its great debt to those who followed the Stars and Stripes from sixty-one to sixty-five. The bill we are now considering, entitled "Increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War," seeks to do justice, but it does not go far enough, and the rules of this House do not permit an amendment except by unanimous consent, and this has been refused.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill returns from the Senate, in my judgment, it will carry an amendment providing a minimum pension of \$30 and a maximum pension of \$40, an increase of 50 per cent. Such action on the part of the Senate will place the Members of this House in the attitude of originally opposing these figures, and in the end we will agree to the Senate amendments. Therefore I think it is unfair, under the parliamentary procedure of the House, that we can not do in the beginning that which we will in the end be forced to do, if we have any legislation on the subject, and the credit for a just pension increase will redound to another body of Congress. None of the pensioners under the provisions of this bill are less than 70 years of age, and when we consider the high cost of the necessities of life, the increased rates in this bill, in the judgment of every just, impartial man, are not sufficient. In normal times, prior to the present war, the Grand Army of the Republic favored a minimum pension of \$30—\$1 a day—and I have no doubt that Members on both sides, in and out of Congress, approved and indorsed that just proposition, and not only favored it but would have so voted had the opportunity presented itself. If it was just and reasonable in times of peace to have a minimum pension of \$30, how can we escape an approval of the proposition that in these extraordinary times, when everything entering into the living of an ex-soldier, now beyond the period of earning capacity, is tremendously higher—higher than ever before—the man over 70 years of age should receive an increase and should have more than the minimum pension—\$25—now paid to the widow of a soldier.

This may be the last general pension bill the American Congress will pass for the fast-disappearing members of the Grand Army of the Republic, and this should be an additional and convincing reason why the measure should be absolutely just, free from criticism, and a well-deserved tribute to the valor, the courage, the heroic work, and the invaluable services of the brave American soldiers who saved and preserved the Republic and who will remain with us but a very brief time.

Not only should a 50 per cent increase be provided for existing pensions, as advocated by the Ed. Maynard and the McKinley Grand Army of the Republic Posts, of Knoxville, Tenn., and thousands of similar organizations throughout the country, but the objectionable section 3 in the pending bill should be stricken out. I am confident we can rely upon the Senate to perform this meritorious act, even if we are not permitted to do so here under the parliamentary rules governing this body without defeating the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I will say that, while the pending bill does not go far enough in the way of increases, it means legislation for the interest and benefit of the survivors of the Union Army, and with all their other friends I will cheerfully vote for its passage, confident the Senate will return it, and that in the end it will meet the full expectations of the soldiers and their friends in and out of Congress.

The action of the Committee on Invalid Pensions in reporting and pressing this bill should be an inspiration to the Committee on Pensions to get busy and redeem the promises made to the soldiers who served in our War with Spain. Justice and fair play demands that they be given their day in court, and the reasonable legislation they have requested at the hands of the

American Congress be passed before the final adjournment. [Applause.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take just one minute of the time in my control for the purpose of stating that I am advised by friends on the other side of the House that my answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] as to whether or not the benefits of this bill would apply to soldiers residing in all foreign countries alike had been misunderstood. I thought I made myself clear that this bill does apply to all soldiers alike, and, of course, those who reside in countries at war with this country will not now receive the increase under this bill, but neither do they receive the pensions due them under existing law, but at the conclusion of the war they doubtless will be entitled to the pension due them under existing law and the benefits of this bill, if it becomes a law, as I hope that it will.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Then I desire to use one minute more. I want to say that for some time past that I have been giving a good share of my attention to the widows of old soldiers, and have a bill on the calendar to amend the widows' pension law, and hope to secure its passage to-day, but I am just as much in favor of good liberal pensions for the old soldiers as their widows. I am strongly in favor of this bill, because I believe it is the best bill we can hope to pass at this time, but I would vote for larger pensions if I thought it would not endanger the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think the old soldiers do not need any reassurance from me that I am their friend and am in favor of liberal pensions. During my 11 years of service in this House I have availed myself of every opportunity to do all that I could to help cheer and brighten the homes of the old veterans and their dependents. I feel that it is as little as I can do to do all that I can for those who risked their lives to preserve the Union of States. These old veterans were paid a pittance in cheap money for hardships and sufferings the younger generation, I fear, too often fail to appreciate. And now in their last days, when they are dropping off at the rate of more than 3,000 per month, with their energies spent, practically all helpless and dependent. I would feel that I was not a good loyal American citizen should I fail to champion their rights justly due them from this great Government which they preserved. I am in favor of paying the boys who are engaged in the present great struggle for liberty and humanity liberally and to provide every comfort possible as a slight recompense for their sacrifices, but we must not, even during this great emergency, forget the old boys of sixty-one to sixty-five, who are sitting helpless and dependent waiting for the final roll call, which is near at hand for all of them. But, Mr. Speaker, I will not be a party to any camouflage that will likely defeat a pension bill at this session of Congress by voting for a big pension which I know will have little chance to become a law. I have done everything I could as a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to hasten this legislation. I believe this is a very good bill, and I am therefore glad to support it. When the bill comes from conference I will cheerfully vote for any bill the conferees agree upon. I am in favor of liberal pensions, but I am for a half loaf rather than no loaf at all.

I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the charge of lack of fairness against the veteran of this House, the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, should have come from my own State of Indiana, if I understood it right. I believe when my colleague considers the matter, he will change his remarks in that respect and give credit to our colleague, this old veteran—

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I have not the time.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman does not want to be unfair.

Mr. BARNHART. I can not yield with only two minutes.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman does not want to put that statement in the Record, does he?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not interrupt the gentleman without his consent.

Mr. BARNHART. The provisions of this bill are a great improvement over the pension law now existing. I understand that it carries an increase of practically 30 per cent in the pension rating. I wish it might be amended in one respect, and that would be by striking out the bar of pensioners with incomes of \$1,000 or more. I have never been in favor of penalizing thrift. It has always seemed to me that when you find a man who has so conducted his affairs as to provide a little security for the proverbial rainy day of old age, he ought not

to be denied the same reward as his fellow comrade and that the increase in rate should be given only to those who have not been quite so frugal or so careful about the future. I trust this provision of the bill may be amended. The other feature which bars from the provisions of this bill the residents of soldiers' homes appeals to me as fair and right. A man who takes refuge in a soldiers' home, I understand, is given about \$400 a year in subsistence by his Government.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It costs the Government that much.

Mr. BARNHART. It costs the Government \$400 a year to support him in the soldiers' home. Now, the man who remains at home and supports himself certainly ought to have a higher rate of pension than the one who depends upon the Government for his living. [Applause.] Justice between man and man fixes that clearly as this bill does if I know justice when I see it.

I wish this increase might be larger, but the committee feels that this bill probably takes as much from the Treasury as Congress and the country would approve at this time of so much need for money, and when everybody is being asked to deny themselves by helping their Government to win the war which now besets us.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to register my protest against this seeming effort to play politics against the Democratic Congress, which has given the old veterans and their widows large increases in their pensions. It always seems to me sacrilegious to attempt to play politics with religion and unpatriotic to play politics with the interests of the veterans who fought to save our country. The inferential charge here by some of my colleagues from Indiana that the Democratic administration is unfriendly to old soldiers is unwarranted, and I believe that every fair-minded old soldier in our country will so regard it.

Let us give these deserving old veterans all we can possibly afford, but let us do it with patriotic gratitude rather than with political design. Gen. SHERWOOD, who won his way to a generalship from the rank of private, may be depended upon to treat his comrades liberally and fairly, and I believe he is doing it in this bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite a lot of nerve for the Democrats to claim credit for pension legislation when their action in this matter, as well as in others, is so apparent. There are individual Democrats of this House as good friends of the veterans as are the Republicans, but the Democratic Party has not been, and its record is against the veterans and pensions. I cite facts and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to prove this. The Sherwood bill—the act of May 11, 1912—has been referred to in this debate, and the Democrats claim credit for it in toto. Let us see what are the facts as to this: The answer is that, on the passage of the Sherwood bill in a House in which the Democrats had a majority of 69, only 97 Democrats out of a total membership of 225 voted for the bill, while 130 Republicans voted for it, and of the 93 votes cast against the bill 90 were Democrats. This was in the Sixty-second Congress. The Senate was in control of Republicans. There, on the passage of the bill, 40 Republicans voted for it and only 11 Democrats. All of the votes cast against the bill—16—were cast by Democrats.

On the conference report the vote in the House is equally significant. The conference report was agreed to—yeas 176, nays 57. Of the 176 votes for the report, 99 were Republicans and 77 were Democrats. All but one of the 57 votes against the report were cast by Democrats; the other negative vote was cast by Mr. KENT, an Independent. There was no record vote in the Senate on the conference report. If anybody doubts the accuracy of these figures, let him examine and analyze the votes for himself. They may be found on pages 284, 285, 4015, and 6242 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the second session of the Sixty-second Congress.

The bill was approved by a Republican President—Taft—on May 11, 1912.

Mr. Speaker, upon the single fact that Gen. SHERWOOD, a Democrat, reported the age-service pension act from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, every Republican member of which supported it enthusiastically, rests the entire claim of the Democratic Party to the credit of passing that law. Whereas if it had not been for Republicans, who have always consistently been the real friends of the soldiers, the law would not have been passed. Even with the name of the distinguished Gen. SHERWOOD attached to it, there would have been no hope of its passage without Republican support. As an individual I give Gen. SHERWOOD all due praise, and I commend the Democrats who followed him. But the action of these individual Democrats is an exception that proves the rule. The historical atti-

tude of the Democratic Party as a party has been and is opposed to a liberal pension system, as shown by the votes of a majority of Democrats in Congress whenever the matter has been put to the test. Because certain individual Democrats have voted now and then for more liberal pensions that does not reflect the true position of their party. Certain individual Democrats may justly be proud of their own votes on pension legislation, but they can not point with pride to the record of the Democratic Party as a whole. For that record, covering over 50 years' time, will not sustain their claim. On the contrary, it is not a record of which any Democratic friend of the soldier—even Gen. SHERWOOD himself—can boast or to which he can point with pride.

I am for increasing the pensions of the old soldiers to the extent that not a single one of them or their dependents shall be in want. But I am opposed to section 3, which withholds the benefit of this increase from the veterans who have an income of \$1,000 a year or are living in soldiers' homes. This will work a hardship on many, as some of them have wives and other dependents that they are bound to support. The House voted against a similar provision in a pension-increase bill several years ago after due consideration. We want to do the best we can for these old heroes. Politics should not enter into discussion of this bill, and I have regretted to see politics even hinted at by my colleague, Judge RUCKER, and the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BARNHART. Both of these gentlemen are friends of the old soldiers. No one doubts that. So are those on the Republican side friends of the veterans. Watch the vote to-day and see where the votes come from that oppose this increase. You will not find a single one on the Republican side, but there will be some on the Democratic side.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that we must consider this bill in the present manner, but every effort has been made not only by the distinguished chairman of this committee, Gen. SHERWOOD, whom every man in this House loves and respects, but every effort was made by gentlemen of the committee on this side—Mr. LANGLEY and Mr. BLAND—to have this matter considered in the House in such a way that amendments might be offered and considered and voted upon, but the Democratic leaders upon the other side did not want this bill considered that way. They are men who generally have always voted against pension legislation of every kind for the old soldiers. They have taken the whip hand and refuse us the permission to do that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the so-called Sulloway bill of the Sixty-first Congress, which passed the House and failed in the Senate. That bill was an age-and-service bill; it required a minimum service of 90 days and allowed very liberal rates of increase. The bill passed the Republican House without a record vote. It has been contended by Democrats that the Republican Party was responsible for its failure in the Senate. This is untrue, and, in support of what I say, I refer to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], who is as familiar with the facts as he is with pension legislation, having had long experience in such matters both in the Pension Bureau and in Congress.

Mr. LANGLEY, on May 18, 1914, said:

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows repeated efforts of Republican Senators to get the bill considered and passed and that these efforts were blocked by Democratic Senators. I ask you to look at page 2883 of the RECORD of February 18, 1911. Senator Scott, of West Virginia, a Republican, asked unanimous consent to take up the bill, and Senator OVERMAN, a Democrat, from North Carolina, objected. Thereupon Senator Scott moved to take up the bill notwithstanding the objection. There were 49 votes in favor of this motion, and 46 of them were Republicans; there were 25 votes against the motion, and 28 of them were cast by Democrats. The RECORD also shows that the action of the Democratic Senators prevented a final vote on the passage of the bill at that time. Again, on the 4th of March following (see pp. 4320-4321 of the RECORD), the last day of the session and the last chance the bill had to become a law in that Congress, a Republican Senator, Mr. CURTIS, of Kansas, asked unanimous consent to take up the bill, and objection was made by Mr. GORR, a Democrat, from Oklahoma. A Republican Senator then moved to take it up notwithstanding this objection, and the vote on that motion showed practically the same political alignment as it did on the other occasion referred to, on February 18. I wish that every soldier in the country and their relatives and friends knew the exact truth about the entire procedure in connection with that bill.

Mr. Speaker, actions speak louder than words. Belated declarations of latter-day Democrats can not change the record. Our splendid pension system, which has no precedent in the world's history, and no peer in justice and generosity among the nations of the earth, is a distinctively Republican institution.

Words are but leaves;
Deeds are fruits.
Words are easy, like the wind,
Faithful friends are hard to find.

The Republican Party points to its deeds in behalf of the Nation's defenders and their widows as a guaranty that it still holds to the sentiment which on a great banner met the

gaze of the soldiers and sailors of the Union Army and Navy who marched down Pennsylvania Avenue, in this city, May 27, 1865:

There is one debt this Nation owes which it can never pay; that is the debt it owes to its soldiers and sailors.

[Applause.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. How much have I?

The SPEAKER. Twenty-two minutes.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, how many minutes were there to each side.

The SPEAKER. Forty.

Mr. LANGLEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have that time, but I am afraid a mistake has been made in the calculation of time. My understanding was that we had 40 minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. You did have; the gentleman has more time than he thought.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the pending bill. However, it is not satisfactory to me in some respects. I regret that no opportunity will be afforded under the rules to offer an amendment to strike out section 3. I regret no opportunity will be afforded to propose an amendment to increase the minimum to \$30 a month.

Ever since I have been a Member of this body I have contended that what was going to be done for soldiers of the Civil War, what was going to be given them to lessen their burdens in their declining years, should be accorded without delay. In view of the fact that, very naturally, the mortality rate was increasing each succeeding year. I have believed all the time that proper increases should be provided for by an amendment of the general law rather than to leave it to the uncertainty and delay of providing for manifestly meritorious cases by separate bills introduced for the relief of a single veteran. Even in such cases as these it has been the observation of Members who have enjoyed considerable service that the great majority of those so provided for have lived but a short time to receive the benefits. I have all the time regarded as fallacious and cold-blooded and very unjust that justice to the soldiers of the Civil War in the form of pensions should be deferred for the reason merely that the aggregate of appropriations for all purposes for the particular session of Congress would be too large to permit of it, when a humane consideration would commend granting to these patriots their just mead, though it be required that bonds be issued for that purpose, which would not have been required.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill just as it is, containing the features objectionable to me, because the parliamentary situation will not permit of an amendment, and that there will be no other opportunity afforded during the present session to take up and pass it under a rules situation more favorable than that which now exists. But I shall vote for it in contemplation or expectation that the Smoot bill will be passed in the Senate, and that a conference will result on the two bills whereby the better provisions of each will be adopted with the objectionable features eliminated. I hope this may result in the adoption of the minimum of \$30 contained in the Smoot bill and at the same time the preservation of the maximum of \$50 contained in the Sherwood bill. I am opposed also to the restriction contained in section 3 of the Sherwood bill denying the benefit of the act to the pensioner whose net annual income is more than \$1,000, one of the principal reasons being the incumbrance which would thereby be added to the administration of the law by the investigations to be made of the amount of net incomes of all pensioners covered by the act, with the consequence of great expense and delay in granting the benefits to those found entitled thereto.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment an increase of the rates of pensions of soldiers of the Civil War is very desirable, not only so but highly expedient, and I favor passing the Sherwood bill now. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, there is more demand in my section of the United States for a reasonable increase of pensions to the old soldiers than any other one piece of legislation except actual war legislation. The purchasing power of a dollar has decreased to less than 60 cents on a dollar, and yet we have not increased the pensions of the old soldiers to keep up with that decrease. They are dying at the rate of 33,232 per year, which was the death rate during 1917. If we do not do something for them now we might as well abandon all intention to do anything

for them, because they will soon all be gone. Here we have this pension bill in a position to-day so that we can not amend it or properly consider it. Forty minutes to consider a pension bill when there are 62,133 veterans in Pennsylvania demanding consideration of this bill and favorable action thereon.

It is simply a parliamentary outrage that this bill is to be put through to-day under suspension of the rules, which forbids amendment, instead of having it taken up to-morrow under a rule for that purpose, when we could amend it. It ought to be amended to increase it to \$30 a month as a minimum rate for every soldier, no matter what his service may have been or the duration of such service, provided he had an honorable discharge.

Let us now briefly review the provisions of this proposed act.

This pension act is designated as H. R. 9959, entitled "A bill increasing the rates of pensions of all sailors and soldiers of the Civil War."

The bill is confined to and deals only with the soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and increases the pensions of these as follows:

Section 1 provides that any person who served in the naval or military service of the United States during the Civil War and was honorably discharged and who is now in receipt of a pension or who shall hereafter be granted a pension, under the provisions of any general or special law, and is entitled to a pension of less than \$25, shall hereafter be \$25 per month. This provision will, of course, grant the minimum sum of \$25 a month to all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the Civil War who served 90 days.

Paragraph 2 of section 1 provides that in case such person attain the age of 70 years and had served one year his rate shall be \$26 per month; for one and one-half years, \$28 per month; two years, \$30 per month; two and one-half years, \$31 per month; three years or over, \$32.50 per month. This, of course, pensions all soldiers and sailors who have attained the age of 70 years according to the amounts given.

Paragraph 3 of section 1 provides that all who have attained the age of 75 years and served 90 days shall be pensioned at \$27 per month; those who served six months, \$29 per month; one year's service, \$31 per month; one and one-half years, \$35 per month; two years and over, \$39 per month. This applies to all the veterans of said war who are over 75 years of age and served as above stated.

Paragraph 4 of section 1 provides that any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty, resulting in his disability, is now unable to perform manual labor, shall be paid at the rate of \$39 per month, without regard to length of service or age.

This is a very important provision and is intended to cover all who served in the Civil War and were honorably discharged, and who from wounds or disease resulting in disability which rendered them unable to perform manual labor shall receive \$39 per month regardless of length of service or age. This is a provision intended to take care of the disabled veterans of the Civil War and is in the direction of what is just and fair. The only criticism I have to make of this provision is that it is not sufficient. It ought to, taking into consideration the purchasing power of money, be at least \$50 per month. The purchasing ability of the dollar is now reduced to 60 cents, measuring by the necessities it will buy, hence this pension instead of being \$39 per month is, in truth and in fact, only \$26 per month, deducting the one-third as the depreciation of the dollar in its purchasing ability. Hence this is not sufficient to support in comfort the veterans who are disabled. This item should be increased to \$50 per month in all fairness.

Section 2 of this bill states a mathematical problem as to the method of increasing pensions, and provides that all honorably discharged soldiers of the Army and Navy of the Civil War, and who are now pensioned at the rate of \$20 per month, shall receive in lieu thereof a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior in multiples of 50 cents nearest approximating 30 per cent additional, and provides that the increase shall not exceed \$50 and that no pension heretofore granted shall be reduced. The method of stating this increase is rather obscure. The purpose of this section is to give 30 per cent increase of all pensions over \$20 per month nearest the multiple of 50 cents. That is, if the pension is \$20 per month, the rate will be \$26; if it is \$22 per month, it will be instead of \$6.00, \$6.50, or \$28.50 per month; if the pension is \$27 per month, instead of the increase being \$8.10 it will be \$8, or \$35 per month.

Section 3 of the bill is a limitation providing that no pensioner shall receive the benefit of this act for any period while

he is an inmate of any State or National soldiers' home, and that no pensioner who has a net annual income from all sources of \$1,000 per year shall receive the benefit of this act. This section is wrong and should be stricken out entirely.

Section 4 provides that the increase shall begin from the date of the approval of this act, and in cases of original pensions hereafter allowed from the date of commencement of such pensions.

Section 5 provides that no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fees shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act.

This detailed analysis of the bill makes clear its several provisions and purposes.

A brief application of its provisions to the facts will enable those interested to determine whether this is the best possible act that could be devised for the relief of the soldiers and sailors of the Civil War. It is not. It falls far short of meeting the needs of our veterans.

The report of the Commissioner of Pensions for the year ending June 30, 1917, shows that there are now on the pension roll 673,111 pensioners of all classes, and that during the fiscal year 1917 the loss by death amounted to 33,232, or a decrease of 9.2 per cent, and that this rate of losses is slightly less than the annual loss for each fiscal year back as far as 1910, the death rate varying from 33,000 to 36,000 per year in round numbers. Hence the number of pensioners is rapidly decreasing, and with their advancing years their wants are naturally becoming more pressing, and the high cost of living and the depreciation in the purchase power of money has caused their wants to become more acute and the suffering of these old veterans to be keener each year. For them to procure the necessities of life in many instances is becoming a serious task.

It is very important, therefore, that when we come to the question of legislation for their relief as a class that the relief proposed should be adequate and sufficient.

By the act of October 6, 1917, all soldiers' widows who married prior to June 27, 1905, were granted a pension of \$25 per month, which in many instances is more than the soldiers themselves receive. I am not criticizing this; it is right. Congress, however, did not intend to act unfairly with the old sailors and soldiers of the Civil War. It is therefore obligatory now that this apparent inequality be promptly cured by increasing the soldiers' pensions.

The application of this bill to the veterans would be as follows:

Increase to \$25 per month (72,619 men).....	\$6,550,077
Increase on account of age and length of service (223,209 men).....	20,159,970
General law and special acts increased 30 per cent (30,519 men).....	2,999,520
Total (326,347 men).....	29,715,567

By this increase the veterans who would have an income of over \$1,000 a year would be stricken from the pension roll, and those who have died since June 3, 1917—probably 25,000—would also reduce the aggregate amount of the pensions, so that if it is a question of what it will cost to put this act in force it would entail an increase in pension appropriations of only about \$22,000,000 the first year, which amount would decrease rapidly with each passing year.

This certainly is not very much money to appropriate for the soldiers and sailors of the War of the Rebellion, who preserved this Nation, when we are appropriating billions of dollars at this time, and increasing the pay rolls of Government employees because of the high cost of living. I submit that the pensions of Civil War veterans should be figured on a basis of the minimum of \$30 per month, or a dollar a day for each soldier. I shall vote for any amendment that will bring about such increase in this bill; that is, I believe the basis upon which these pensions should be figured because of the high cost of living and the low purchasing power of money at this time.

Our debt to the soldiers of the Civil War can never be repaid, no matter how much we proclaim our gratitude or how much money we give them. The average age of the Civil War veterans is now 73 years.

If Congress intends to help them in their declining years, now is the time. Every dollar in the Treasury of the United States is there because the soldiers of the War of the Rebellion fought and suffered and died to put it there. We have our country because our soldiers made it possible for us to have it. I am going to vote for this bill because it is better than the present law and for the further reason that I believe that the Senate will amend it and in some measure do justice to our heroes of the Civil War. We have been liberal with our soldiers who are now fighting in this righteous war. Now let us be but just, for we can never be too liberal with our honored veterans of the Civil War.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OSBORNE].

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have a rather extensive acquaintance among the members of the Grand Army of the Republic in the United States. I have attended their national conventions a great many years. There have been some criticisms which I feel I am in position to say are unfounded, and one of them is that there is any lack of appreciation of the distinguished services of the gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, in the matter of pensions. He is regarded as a tried and true friend of the soldiers and his comrades of the Civil War. There is also a very kind feeling toward the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], the author of the widows' pension bill. Those two measures have been of immense service.

This bill will, even if it is finally agreed to in its present form, be a great improvement on the present law, and it seems to be about the only thing that we are in a position to get at this time. I am greatly in hopes that it will come back from the Senate in such a way that we can get rid of this section 3, which reads as follows:

Sec. 3. That no pensioner shall be entitled to receive any benefits under the provisions of this act for any period during which he shall be an inmate of any State or national soldiers' home; and the provisions of this act shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] spoke about the righteousness of cutting out the members of the soldiers' homes. The gentleman should take into account that the members of the soldiers' homes very often have families, their faithful old wives, who are dependent upon them and who live outside.

Old soldiers do not become members of the soldiers' homes except as a matter of extremity. When they do, if they have aged wives living, they are compelled to break up their own homes, and the wives go to some relative or take a little cottage near the soldiers' home of which the husband is a member. The soldier's pension then becomes the reliance for a frugal living for the wife, and it is difficult to conceive a more worthy employment for it.

There are now a few more than 300,000 Civil War pensioners on the rolls, and they are passing away at the average rate of about 100 per day, 3,000 per month, or 36,000 per year. Their average age is above 73 years. These honored men, in their youth the brave defenders of our country, will not long be with us. Let us honor ourselves as we honor them by making the evening of their lives as serene and free from care as it is possible to do with a fairly liberal pension. I would, if it rested with me, make the minimum pension \$30 per month, running up to \$50, in accordance with length of service and physical disability. I would cut out both the provisions of section 3, which deprive members of soldiers' homes and men with an annual income of \$1,000 or more of pension.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this bill to increase the pensions of soldiers. It is certainly no more than justice to do so. We have increased the salaries of the Government officials, all upon the theory that it is impossible for them to live as formerly on account of the increased cost of living. The cost of living has increased within the last few years on an average of 40 per cent, and this pension bill only makes a general increase of 30 per cent.

The old soldiers are now very few indeed. They are all aged and many of them require attention as well as food and nourishment. It is quite impossible for them to maintain themselves in the way we want them upon the old pension basis since the high cost of living has become so great in this country.

These men, who were willing to go to the front and protect the Stars and Stripes, are entitled to every consideration on the part of a great and beneficent Government. We are now engaged in one of the greatest conflicts the world has ever known. We are engaged in this conflict as a mighty Nation, extending from north to south and east to west. Through this great union of all of our people we are able to wage this war as perhaps no other nation as young as ours could have done. It is largely through the efforts of those who fought in the Civil War and thereby maintained the Union that we are able to bring together this great mass of people and enter them into the conflict as a solid and united Nation.

There should be no politics whatever in this controversy. It should be the desire of each and every Member of this House, as I am sure it is the will of the citizens of this great country, that these men be treated absolutely fair and just; that they shall not want for anything in their old age in the way of attention, nor food, or anything that is necessary. I shall, therefore, vote for this bill with a great deal of satisfaction, feeling that we should take care of those who at such a critical time in the history of our Nation helped maintain and preserve it as one great people, able to-day to stand for the freedom of the people and democracy throughout the world. It was through these veterans and those who have gone to their long home that we were maintained a great Nation. Nothing is too good for them, and I am proud that God has so prospered us that we can do them justice.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute in order that I may ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague be extended one minute, not to be charged against the time so far granted, so that he can ask him a question. Is there objection?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that this is the one bill at this session of general interest affecting the interests of so many thousands that has been put in a parliamentary strait-jacket, to be run through so that deliberation can not be had on it, and no amendment can be made except by unanimous consent. I desire to amend this bill. I shall present an amendment, and hope that there will be no objection to its consideration; if given consideration, I am confident that it will prevail.

There are many thousand young men who served from 30 to 90 days in the Union Army toward the close of the Civil War. In fact there was an army, coming from every State in the North, whose addition to the Union forces became so impressive to the leaders of the South—Davis, Lee, and Johnston—that they helped to bring the war to an early conclusion. I shall move to amend, giving \$25 per month to all who served not less than 30 days nor more than 90 in the Union Army and were honorably discharged.

I am opposed to two features of this bill, but I expect to vote for this bill, as it is the best we can get at this time. I expect further to vote for a better bill after this has passed here, has gone to the Senate, and come back through conference. If we do our duty by the members of the Grand Army now we in effect will say to the boys abroad, "We propose to treat you right; we show you definite evidence of it when we treat generously the members of the Grand Army of the Republic." Twenty years hence Congress will be treating right the members of the supreme Army of the Republic when victory has been achieved and they shall come home. [Applause.]

The Smoot-Bland bill should be considered here and substituted for this one. Every soldier who served 90 days should receive a dollar a day pension. We can stand it; it will not be long. Forty-minute debate on a side. During that time the lives of five Union defenders will have passed away. Five "white robes" will have been exchanged for faded coats of blue.

The Smoot-Bland bill provides a graduated scale of from \$30 to \$40 per month. This would amount to an increase per annum over present law of \$40,000,000. We saved that much the other day by our cutting down the wild-cat mineral bill that amount.

There are two highly objectionable features in this bill which if it was being considered in the regular way would be cut out by a majority vote of this House. But, of course, we know that to save these provisions is the reason for this bill coming in an unamendable form. The first of these features is the clause which denies the veteran the benefit of this act while he is an inmate of a State or National soldiers' home. That is another way of branding as charity what should be considered the just and generous recognition for age attained and service rendered. I resent it. What business of ours is it if the State of Nebraska or other State sees fit to provide a comfortable home for its resident Civil War veterans? Moreover, if this increase be given to those who stay part of the time in a soldiers' home it

would enable them to take longer furloughs to visit with their friends, and so enjoy more fully their sunset walk of life. Are these State soldiers' homes of such a character that the inmates should under this bill in effect be penalized from \$10 to \$15 a month for being found in one of them? The reason given seems to be, "For your lack of thrift evidenced by your being sent to a soldiers' home you are penalized."

The second feature which should be taken from this bill is that which denies the soldier its benefits if his net annual income, including his pension, exceeds \$1,000. The blind soldier, who has walked in darkness since the close of the war and whose pension is \$72 per month, would take nothing under this bill on account of one of its limitations.

Of course I do not believe or charge that this bill was put into this inflexible parliamentary groove to beat the blind, but it could have that effect. We can not remove the limitation. It forcibly illustrates why the bill should have been thrown open to amendment. So would its favoring provisions be denied any soldier who by thrift could accumulate enough money to buy a liberty bond, contribute to the Red Cross, or become subject to the Government income tax.

Contrast for a moment these two features. In each case the Civil War veteran is penalized. In the first, penalized for his lack of thrift; in the second, punished because of his thrift.

It reminds us of the old doctrine:

If you can, you can't;
If you will, you won't;
You'll be damned if you do,
You'll be damned if you don't.

The logic of this bill and these two ill-sorted provisions would start a grin in a Griffin and draw a smile from a satyr. Such logic would overturn the multiplication table, revoke the rule of three, and repudiate Euclid.

Why mar this act intended to be just and generous with these two unjust and ungenerous provisions? They can be considered by the recipients as a "fly in the ointment" and a "hole in the doughnut."

They can work out only as the means of vexatious delays in considering, proving, and determining the case of each beneficiary. As you present this rose of beauty and fragrance to a grateful recipient, why insist upon including this malignant and exotic thorn?

I trust that when this bill returns it will have shed these two malignant features, that the minimum for soldiers of 90 days' service or more shall be \$30, with generous maximum, and that those young soldiers who came into service near the close of the war and who heretofore have had no recognition shall be given a pensionable status, because it was not their fault, but to some extent their credit, that the war closed so soon and their terms were so short. If this be all done a generous people will approve and the grateful veterans will rise up and "call you blessed." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I feel like apologizing for taking the time of the House. I will vote for this bill. I have always supported generous pension legislation and expect to continue to do so. It seems to me, however, that modesty would suggest that when such unscarred veterans as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] and myself discuss pension legislation on the floor of this House we should hesitate to question the good faith of men who actually served on the field of battle, as did our distinguished colleague from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD. [Applause.] I have followed the general's lead on pension legislation and many other questions, because I have always felt that he was one Member of this House whose Americanism could not be questioned. [Applause.] I feel that when he comes here and presents a pension bill that vitally affects the men who fought with him on the field of battle we are justified in believing it is the very best legislation that can be obtained under the circumstances. I therefore do not apologize for voting for this measure under suspension of the rules. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for one minute.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Speaker, I came to this Congress and voted for the Sherwood bill in the Sixty-second Congress. As a small boy I remember many of the men who went to the front

during the years of 1861 to 1865. I am probably one of few men here that do. But I know what those men did, and therefore I have been in favor ever since coming here, on every occasion, of doing whatever I can for them.

This bill is better than the law which we now have on the statute books, and I shall vote for it. I had been in hopes that the minimum rate on this bill would have been \$30, and if another body shall amend it, it will give me pleasure to sustain the conference committee if they will agree to it.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the motion to suspend the rules and pass this bill, although I think it ought to be amended in two important particulars. It is unfortunate that the parliamentary situation under which the bill is brought before the House is such as to prevent offering amendments. Section 3, which exempts inmates of soldiers' homes and any soldier having an income of \$1,000 per year from receiving the benefits of the bill, ought to be stricken out and the minimum amount of pension that any soldier who served in the Civil War shall receive ought to be increased.

There is no doubt in my mind but what a majority of the Members of the House favor a substantial increase in the pensions of the old soldiers, and if given the opportunity they would increase the minimum fixed in the bill and strike out the whole of section 3. It is unfortunate that the bill is presented to the House under such circumstances as to make it impossible for the Members to express themselves on these two important questions. It may be that this is the best that the friends of the old soldiers on the Committee on Invalid Pensions could do for them. It is quite possible that they could get no other opportunity to bring the bill up, but the fact is to be regretted just the same.

However, there is nothing for the individual Member who is in favor of increasing the pensions of old soldiers to do but to vote for the bill. It is better than the present law, and for that reason I shall vote for it although it is not as good as it ought to be. I would like an opportunity to amend it, and I regret that my request for unanimous consent to make a motion to strike out section 3 was objected to. Nevertheless the bill is here and must be voted up or voted down as it is. Every Member must accept the situation and do what is best under the circumstances. Once the bill is through the House there is a well-grounded belief that the Senate will raise the minimum and strike out the restrictions in section 3. If that is done, those who are in favor of that action will have a chance to express themselves when the bill is sent to conference. I shall vote for the bill with this in view, because it is better than the present law and with the hope that before the legislation is finally enacted into law the bill will be changed in the manner I have suggested. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAPES. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this measure as it is drawn is satisfactory to a dozen men in this House. Therefore I think it is very unfortunate that opportunity is not given to amend it to make it more satisfactory.

There is no one here who has a higher regard for our distinguished friend and patriot from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, than I. I know that for years and years throughout this whole country he has been acclaimed as the friend of the old soldier. I know that they believe that he has been and is still continuing to do his utmost to better their condition. They have looked upon him as being the one man before all others who would eventually bring them a dollar a day. I regret more than I can express that the friend of the old soldier who has been looked to all this time can not now see fit to stand as the sponsor of that for which he has been given credit throughout all these years and give them now a dollar a day.

The old soldier is passing very rapidly. More than 6,000 of them have crossed the line since this bill was introduced. One of them has been dying each 18 minutes since we have been in session here this morning. The State of Indiana enlisted 224,000 men in that Grand Army of the Republic. Of that number but 18,000 remain, so that they are going very fast, and what relief is to be afforded them must not be very long delayed.

The private during the Civil War who served four years received for his entire service but \$624. If we were simply equalizing the pay to-day, the amount of \$1 per day would be a mere pittance in comparison with the payment that the soldier boys are now receiving, and we are all in favor of their receiving what they are getting. I believe on reflection that none of us would be willing to vote against an equalization, if that were possible to make. I know that this bill will be a disappointment to every Grand Army post in the United States. I know it will be a disappointment to the commander in chief of the Grand Army, who lives in my State. I was talking to him a few days ago in New Hampshire, when he said that the boys throughout the United States were looking to this Congress to pass what is known as the Smoot bill. With that the old veterans will be content, that is what they are expecting, and that is the least they should have. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this Congress I introduced a bill to increase generally the pensions of Civil War veterans; those drawing less than \$30 per month would be increased by a sum equal to 40 per cent of the pension now received; those drawing \$30 or more and less than \$40 per month would be increased by a sum equal to 33½ per cent of the pension now received, and those drawing \$40 or more and less than \$55 would be increased by a sum equal to 20 per cent of the pension now received, with a minimum pension of \$30 per month.

On January 11 last I made a speech expressing my position relative to this matter, and I think I have placed a copy of that speech in the hands of every Member of this House. So my position is well known. I desire to call the attention of the House at this time to the fact that while we increased the pensions of the Civil War veterans substantially in the Sherwood bill, yet when you look at the increased cost of living since 1890, when the dependent pension bill was passed, the Sherwood bill only kept pace with the increased cost of living up to 1912, regardless of the increased age of the Civil War veterans. The cost of living continues to mount skyward, and we must give greater consideration to their increased age, as they are practically all now 72 and upward. The passage of this legislation, or the passage of a bill at this time generally increasing the pensions of the Civil War veterans, will likely be the last time that the Congress will ever have an opportunity of expressing its gratitude in the shape of pension legislation for any considerable number of the old Civil War veterans, as the next decade will find only a negligible number remaining.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the chairman of the committee, Gen. SHERWOOD. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentlemen who have been criticizing the action of the chairman of the committee, that this morning by the unanimous action of my committee I was authorized to ask unanimous consent to have this bill considered in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and if not given that unanimous consent I was ordered by my committee to move the suspension of the rules. No member of that committee will deny that fact, so I am acting under instructions of the committee. The Speaker will verify my statement that I tried to get this bill up in such a way that it could be amended, but was not successful. The bill has been on the calendar for over two months, during which time 6,250 old soldiers have died. I want to get this bill over to the Senate. It was said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this was a parliamentary outrage. I did not commit the first parliamentary outrage. That was committed on the 10th of January, 1911, when the Sulloway bill was reported out under suspension of the rules, carrying \$75,000,000, and my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] was in charge of that bill, and he refused on the floor of the House to accept any amendment whatever. Now, gentlemen, when this bill comes back from conference you will all have a chance to discuss the report of the conferees. In 1912 we passed a bill here after three days' debate and sent it over to the Senate, and when that

bill got through the conferees there was not a Member of the House who could recognize the bill. [Laughter.] I have worked for this thing for four years, as my Republican friends know, and I never made a political speech on pension legislation on the floor of the House. I regret that my friend from Indiana [Mr. BLAND], a member of the committee, should have reflected upon the chairman of this committee, but I can take care of myself among the old soldiers all right. [Applause.]

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield there just for a question right on this point?

Mr. SHERWOOD. I do not yield. I have only three minutes.

Mr. BLAND. I should like to ask that the gentleman's time be extended.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that Gen. SHERWOOD's time be extended two minutes, not to be charged up. Is there objection?

Mr. KINCHELOE. I object.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Now, if you want to know how the old soldiers stand on this bill, I can give you some indication. When the gentleman from Indiana stated that the old soldiers were opposed to this bill, he could not produce the record of a single Grand Army post in the United States that was opposed to this bill, not one. That shows how the old soldiers stand on it, and I think, probably, I know nearly as much about the sentiments of old soldiers as does the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND]. [Applause.] I do not claim that the pending bill is adequate to meet the high cost of living at this time, but it will help. It will give hope and cheer to many an old veteran now staggering to a near-by grave. He will know by this legislation that the Congress of the United States appreciates the heroic sacrifice in the great war of over a half century ago, and that there is a spirit in this Congress to alleviate the woes and hardships under which he is now laboring in his old age. It is a patriotic measure, and a grateful offering to every one of my old comrades with whom I touched elbows in the four years of that terrible war, to know we do not propose that the gallant men, who from 1861 to 1865, fought in nearly 2,000 battles shall be turned out to frost-bitten grass and cold neglect like a worn-out dray horse.

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred the Smoot bill to this bill, and for that reason I regret that there is no opportunity of amending the bill under the parliamentary status. If that opportunity were afforded, there would be amendments offered, because my good friend and distinguished colleague, Gen. SHERWOOD, just now suggested that he is not satisfied with the bill as written. But I am now convinced that this is all we can get. It is a good deal better than what we already have, and I shall join the General in supporting the measure. However, I wish we might have the opportunity to amend it, so as to make the minimum at least \$30, and the maximum at least \$50. I would also strike out the provision which forbids a pensioner receiving any pension should he become an inmate of a soldiers' home. I would also omit that part of the bill that refuses a pension to a person whose annual income is \$1,000 from all sources.

Mr. Speaker, we should regard this roll of men not as a charity. That feature I know appears in the Government's gratuities, but a debt is due these veterans, and simply because one has been more successful than another in this world's affairs is not conclusive against his being placed on this roll. Such legislation in its discrimination makes the pensioner take on the character of a suppliant, and has the tendency to set him apart as an object of governmental charity. This is unfair to those who receive it, and it is also unfair to those who are denied it. These are among the reasons I regret a situation has been forced upon us which forbids amendment.

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL].

Mr. VESTAL. Mr. Speaker, this bill in its present form is a disappointment to me, and in my judgment will be a disappointment to the Grand Army of the Republic. I do not believe it meets with the approval of the majority of the House. Yet, on account of the parliamentary situation it can not be amended, and no amendment can be even offered, except by unanimous consent, which has already been refused.

We are therefore put in the position of having to support the bill in its present form or not at all. I shall support the measure, hoping that it will be revised by the Senate and in conference so as to more nearly meet the present needs of the soldiers.

Early in the session I introduced a general pension bill providing for \$50 per month for all Union soldiers of the Civil War who had served 30 days or more and who had received an honorable discharge. The bill I introduced read as follows:

[H. R. 6973, 65th Cong., 2d sess. In the House of Representatives, Dec. 5, 1917. Mr. VESTAL introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ordered to be printed.]

A bill fixing rate of pension for soldiers of the Civil War.

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Army, including Regulars, Volunteers, and militia, or any officer in the Navy or Marine Corps of the United States, or any enlisted man, however employed in the military or naval service of the United States or in its Marine Corps, whether regularly mustered or not, and who served for a period of 30 days or more in said Army, Navy, or Marine Corps during the Civil War, and who has received or may hereafter receive an honorable discharge, shall, from and after the passage of this act, be entitled to receive a pension at the rate of \$50 per month upon proof of the fact of his service in said Army for the time hereinbefore indicated: *Provided*, That any person who is now on the pension rolls of the United States for services rendered in said Army shall be entitled to the pension herein provided for without any additional proof.

SEC. 2. That this act shall in no wise reduce the amount of the pension now being received by any officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War where said pension is in excess of the amount provided for herein.

This bill was indorsed by practically every Grand Army post in my district and by numerous posts over the country, and I received scores of letters from old veterans in favor of the measure. I understand, of course, that such a bill has objectionable features, but no general pension bill that we could frame would be absolutely free from criticism; and it does seem to me that if we ever intend to do justice to the defenders of the Union that still survive now is the time to do it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I was not particularly wedded to my bill. I am for any measure that will substantially increase the soldiers' pensions. I am not averse to a pension bill based upon service, but I do not believe such a bill should cut out certain classes of men, as this bill proposes to do.

At the close of the session we passed a bill increasing the pensions of the widows of old soldiers to \$25 per month. I voted for that measure because it was right, but there are scores of old veterans under the present pension law that are drawing less than \$25 per month.

Mr. Speaker, it is a limited by everyone that the purchasing price of a dollar to-day is only about half what it was in normal times. Admitting that the soldiers were properly cared for by the present pension laws in normal times, we should at least increase their pensions to the extent of the difference in the cost of living now and under normal conditions.

This bill does not do that. It fails to provide any increase of pension at all for two classes of soldiers, and the increases it does provide are not, in my judgment, sufficient to meet present conditions.

If amendments could be offered to this bill and voted upon, I am sure the House would pass a bill giving substantial relief.

If permitted, I would offer an amendment striking out section 3 of the bill and also fixing the minimum pension at \$30 per month, and increase this amount on the basis of service to a maximum of \$50 per month. I want to express my appreciation of the old veterans of the Civil War in dollars and cents and not in mere words of praise for their heroic deeds. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have attended Memorial Day exercises and have heard men tell of the heroic deeds of the men from '61 to '65; how they went forth to sacrifice their lives, if need be, to save the Union. Probably not a single Member of this body but what has spoken to the old soldiers of his district, praising their valor and patriotism, all of which is just and proper; but the old soldiers can not live on fine phrases or beautiful rhetoric; it takes something more substantial, and, so far as I am concerned, I would like to show my appreciation of the sacrifices of these men by giving them a substantial increase in their pensions, so that in their last days at least they would feel that the Government for which they fought and sacrificed had kept its faith with them.

Mr. Speaker, section 3 of this bill ought to be stricken out. Thousands of soldiers have gone to soldiers' homes because the meager pensions they receive would not keep them. If they were given substantial pensions, many of them would leave the homes at once and feel that they were not wards of charity. I do not believe that any soldier goes to a soldiers' home from choice. They are compelled to go because of the small pensions they receive.

The \$1,000 clause should, in my judgment, be stricken out. Why should a soldier who has given, say, two and one-half years of his life to the cause of the Union be refused an increase in pension because he has been thrifty and has an annual

income of more than \$1,000? Is a man's income, or lack of income, to be the determining factor as to his service?

The bill proposed here carries an increase of about \$20,000,000. If section 3 should be stricken from the bill and the bill amended to make the minimum \$30 per month, with a maximum of \$50 per month, based upon the length of service, it would carry an increase of probably \$60,000,000 to \$70,000,000. But should we refuse, or even hesitate, to take from the Treasury, which these men sacrificed to save, a sufficient amount to help them in their declining days?

Mr. Speaker, I have great love for the South. I have great admiration for the men who suffered and died, many of them, for a cause which they believed to be just. But, nevertheless, it is these men for whom we are legislating to-day, with thousands of their comrades who have passed to the great beyond, who made it possible for us, in this great crisis, to have a united country. More than 50 years have passed since that struggle, and I thank God to-day that no semblance of bitterness or strife exists. We have long since learned that there is no geography in American manhood and that there are no sections in American patriotism.

On this very day, in many a vine-clad cottage in fair New England and in old plantation homes in North Carolina and Tennessee, may be seen hanging over the mantelpiece, bound together in love and honor, two crossed swords, carried to battle, respectively, by one who wore the blue and one who wore the gray.

Only a few years ago the sons of the northern soldiers contested in friendly rivalry with the sons of the gray on the fire-swept steeps of El Caney. We have seen the sons of the gray carrying the Stars and Stripes over the Spanish intrenchments in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the far-away Philippines. We have seen the day when the sons of the blue and the sons of the gray bivouacked together on the hills overlooking Santiago, and have seen their blood mingled in a common cause in the trenches around that stricken city.

And to-day thousands of men from the North, the South, the East, and the West, knowing but one country and one flag, are offering their lives on the sunny plains of France that military autocracy shall forever be destroyed and that the peoples of all nations, great and small, shall have individual political freedom. They are offering their lives for the life and existence of our Nation, the same Nation for whose existence these veterans of the Civil War offered their lives.

We have justly appropriated billions of dollars to care for the present defenders of our country in a war waged not alone for self-defense and self-preservation, but for humanity. Shall we longer delay just pensions to the defenders of the Union and the flag we love?

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to these men that it can never repay, no matter how great the pensions.

I shall support this bill, sincerely hoping that section 3 will be stricken out and a more liberal increase granted by the Senate. [Applause.]

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of liberal pensions for all of the soldiers of the Civil War who have an honorable service and have been honorably discharged. And while the Sherwood bill now under discussion by the House does not in all respects come up to my idea of what a liberal pension is, I am going to vote for it, as it is more liberal than the law now in force.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that this bill had to come up under suspension of the rules, so that it is, as has been well said in this debate, in "a parliamentary strait-jacket," not subject to or open for amendment, and we have to vote for it or against it as it stands. I would like to see the bill amended to give the soldier a dollar a day as a minimum pension and to strike out that section of the bill that excludes the soldiers in soldiers' homes and those who have an income of \$1,000 per year, for the reason that it will take so much time to adjudicate and determine the amount of the various soldiers' incomes that many of these deserving veterans will have passed to their reward before the Pension Bureau will have been able to settle upon the amounts of their various incomes.

We can never as a Nation repay the soldiers of the Civil War for the many hardships and privations which they had to undergo during that terrible struggle, and now that they are old and many of them are helpless I feel that we should give to them that which is justly their due without having any unnecessary strings tied to it.

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this bill because it is the best we can get at this time. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] has been attacked by

Democrats because they say he has talked politics in connection with the bill. Well, his forceful remarks in behalf of the old soldiers may not be pleasing to Democrats, but everyone here knows that he has done more than all the rest put together to bring this bill before the House in the proper way. [Applause.] His brief but splendid speech last Saturday aroused the House to the danger threatening the bill and paved the way for bringing the bill early and properly before the House, and his effort, continued to-day, would have been successful but for the determined opposition of the Democratic leaders, whose course was approved on that side of the House. I object to the feature of this bill which excludes from its benefits soldiers who are in soldiers' homes. Everyone knows that soldiers in homes are there on account of extreme poverty, and they of all others should have the benefit of the increase of pensions. I object to the feature which withholds the benefits of this law from those who are enjoying incomes of \$1,000 a year or more. I have time to speak of only one objection to this feature, and that is the difficulty in determining the amount of a soldier's income whether or not he is entitled to the increase. I have had some experience in pension matters, and those which have given most trouble are those requiring investigation to determine whether or not a widow was entitled to a pension; whether or not she was enjoying an income of \$250 a year. I think that ought to be stricken out. It ought to be eliminated.

I object further because this bill is not automatic; because, if it becomes a law, soldiers will be required to furnish proof as to age and length of service, and thus suffer long delay and much inconvenience. The law ought to be so drafted that the increases will be allowed without further proof and without application by the soldiers. But in spite of these defects I shall vote for the bill, hoping that the Senate will pass the Smoot bill, and that the House will later have sense enough to accept the Senate bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE].

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I shall support this bill. I very much hoped that we would have an opportunity to offer some amendments, or at least that I should have an opportunity to support some amendments to its features. I regret exceedingly the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves this morning, which makes this impossible. I believe that there should be a minimum of \$30 per month. I believe this country is too big and too grand not to offer this small compensation to the soldiers who protected that flag. I would like also to see the maximum amount raised to \$50 a month.

I extend my remarks by printing in the RECORD a letter with resolutions adopted by a Grand Army post, in Colorado, favoring, in preference to this bill, the provisions of the Senate "Smoot bill," which provisions I had hoped to have opportunity to support to-day rather than the bill before us. The letter is as follows:

GEORGE H. THOMAS POST, No. 7,
GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC,
DEPARTMENT OF COLORADO AND WYOMING,
Fort Collins, Colo., April 30, 1918.

To Hon. J. F. SHAFROTH and C. S. THOMAS, Senators, and to the Hon. B. C. HILLIARD, C. B. TIMBERLAKE, EDWARD KEATING, and EDWARD T. TAYLOR, Representatives.

GENTLEMEN: At a regular meeting of the George H. Thomas Post, No. 7, the Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, the matter of pensions for the survivors of the Civil War being under consideration, a committee was appointed to draw up a suitable appeal to our Senators and Representatives in Congress to assist and advance the interests of the veterans in the matter of increasing their pensions. In accordance with this action may we not submit the following premises: At the outbreak of the "War of the Rebellion" the loyal sons of the North responded to the call of President Lincoln with a firm and resolute determination to preserve the Union of States. For more than four years the conflict was waged with varying success, and the success of the Union Army justifies the assertion that the cause was just. Our Government has rendered tardy justice to these men who saved the Union. Now, after a lapse of more than a half of a century, and in their declining years, they are unable to maintain themselves by their individual efforts, and many of them are wholly dependent upon the insufficient bounty now bestowed upon them by our Government to meet the ever increasing cost of their daily sustenance.

In view of these facts they hereby most earnestly appeal to you and to this great Nation to grant them an increased pension sufficient for their support during the few years remaining to them, and we most earnestly request your hearty support and earnest endeavors to enact into law the "Smoot bill" now before Congress, that being, as we believe, a just increase in their behalf.

Most respectfully submitted.

R. O. TENNEY.
H. I. GARBUTT.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL].

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for this bill, because it is the best we can get at this time. I regret that the bill can not be amended and enlarged. I am sure if the House

had an opportunity it would amend the bill and increase these pensions.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am exceedingly glad that the House is finally able to take up the question of the passage of a bill to increase the pensions of the soldiers of the Civil War. I expect to cast my vote in favor of this measure, which grants an increase in pensions of approximately 30 per cent. The bill provides for a minimum of \$25 and a maximum of \$50.

The bill is, of course, in charge of the majority party, and since it is up under a suspension of the rules, no amendment can be offered without unanimous consent, which has already been refused. It seems to me that this legislation was of sufficient importance to justify the bringing of the measure before the House in the usual way, so amendments might have been offered and considered. The minimum should have been raised to \$30, and I had intended, if the bill had been so brought before the House as to be subject to amendment, to offer an amendment to increase the minimum to \$30. I think the section should be stricken out that deprives the man with an income of \$1,000 from the benefits of the bill and which deprives the soldier who has been unfortunate enough to go to the old soldiers' home of its benefits. Why should either class be omitted? They both served the country well and faithfully. The wages of skilled employees have been greatly increased; the scale of wages for unskilled labor has been advanced, and increases have been given to Government employees.

The reason for this was on account of the increase in the cost of living. When the cost of living was not so high the amount of pension received by the soldiers under the former laws went a long way toward furnishing them with the necessities of life; but the cost of living, of food, clothing, fuel, and all of the necessities of life, has advanced by such leaps and bounds that the amount paid the soldier becomes a mere pittance and is soon gone. The amount of the increase ought at least to have been sufficient to have met the difference in the cost of living now and in normal times.

This Congress has appropriated billions of dollars for the purpose of carrying on the present war, and no word of criticism is heard against these vast and unprecedented appropriations. Every American wants his country preserved, the rights of its citizens protected, and its flag saved from dishonor. Our hearts swell with just pride as the youth of to-day go forth to battle for our common country. During the past year no honor has been too great to heap upon the young soldier—God bless him—who leaves his peaceful and happy pursuits to go forth in battle array for his country. How proud we are of his gallant bravery; but while our eyes are turned toward these new patriots these old battle-scarred heroes of the past must not be neglected or forgotten.

There was a time, over a half century ago, when these men for whom this legislation is being passed stepped with light, step and stood erect—the flower of the youth of that generation. My father, James Sanders, volunteered in Company F of the Thirty-first Indiana Infantry before he was 16 years of age, and served for four and one-half years—and until the country was united by the victory of the Union Army. He and many of his comrades have passed away; they no longer answer the roll call here, but must respond to the roll call over yonder. Soon they will all be gone. In this grave crisis, when we are assembling our might to fight the new battle, America must not forget that it is because of the victories achieved by the men of '61 and '65 that we enter this mighty struggle a united people with the united resources and wealth and power of these United States.

I have heartily supported and advocated the passage of legislation to care for the new soldier in khaki, to protect those dependent upon him, and to lighten the burden of those at home who are bereft of his kindly care. Let us also care for these old comrades in blue, whom the Almighty has spared these many years; their presence and counsel has been a source of profound inspiration to us when we of the present generation have been called upon to pay the cost for a secure and respected Nation. Let us cheer them in their declining days and keep them here as long as we can. When the American soldiers abroad shall have fought their last battle on the bloody fields of France, crushed the foe of civilization, and come back at last to their native land these old patriots will join the heroes upon their triumphant return, and in a grand review they shall march together, these noble heroes of two wars, all equally honored and praised and loved by the peoples of this Republic which they have preserved and defended. [Applause.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SNOOK].

Mr. SNOOK. Mr. Speaker, I believe there are two reasons why the pensions of the soldiers of the Civil War should be increased at this time. The first reason is that nearly all the soldiers have reached the period of life where they are unable to longer do any work or to help themselves. The next reason is that when we passed the war-risk insurance bill we so generously provided for the soldiers engaged in the present war and for the widows of the Civil War veterans, then it becomes the duty of Congress to now look after the veterans of the war of 1861.

It is estimated that there are now only 300,000 soldiers of the Civil War left on the pension roll of the Government. The average age of these pensioners is estimated at 73 years.

This body of men are all that are left of those who carried on that great war for the preservation of the Union. They are becoming feeble and are now wholly unable to work and are therefore entitled to just and generous treatment.

In discussing what kind of pension legislation should be adopted at this session of Congress, I have often expressed the opinion that the minimum rate should be \$30 per month with an increase as to age and length of service in the war on a basis similar to that in existing law.

However, the pending bill was favorably reported to the House by the Committee on Invalid Pensions and has been brought up to-day for consideration by a motion made by the chairman of that committee to suspend the rules. Therefore, under the rules of the House, having been brought up in this way, it can not be amended. It, however, carries a substantial increase of pension to the soldiers of the Civil War.

It affords the only opportunity I have had to help these soldiers to secure any increase in the rate of their pensions and I shall therefore gladly take the opportunity of voting for its passage.

I do not favor the provisions of section 3, providing that the law shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more. If this provision is adopted, it will require the pensioner to offer proof upon this subject and the question will be left to the decision and interpretation of some officer in the Pension Department.

My experience with similar provisions, heretofore carried in the pension laws, is that they have led to great delay and sometimes to injustice.

The men who receive the benefit of this law, as I have already said, are now quite old and will not live long to enjoy the pension it provides for. If they are to receive help at all, it must be given at once.

In my judgment it is wrong to adopt a policy that will lead to delay. What is needed most of all is a law that requires just as little proof as possible and requires no interpretation.

It has been stated several times in the course of this debate that this bill will be amended in the Senate. I wish to express the hope that it may be amended in the two particulars to which I have called attention, the elimination of the provision in section 3 and the raising of the minimum rate to \$30 per month.

I wish to close these brief remarks as I began, that I am supporting this bill not because I think it is the best that could be adopted, or all that the soldiers ought to have in the way of a pension at this time, but because it is far better than the existing law and grants a substantial increase of pension to men who deserve it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BESH LIN].

Mr. BESH LIN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Invalid Pensions has submitted the pending bill to the House for its consideration and favors its early enactment into law. Every Member has had in mind doing full justice to the old soldiers who served in the Union Army during the Civil War. Those who survive are fast disappearing. I understand that there are less than 300,000 now living and that they are passing away at the rate of one every 18 minutes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. There are 306,000 now living.

Mr. BESH LIN. So before long this great army responsible for the preservation of the Union will have entirely passed away. The committee, under the leadership of its chairman, the gallant gentleman from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, recognizing not only the service of these men to their country in its hour of trial but also their advanced years and infirmities of age,

desires to provide a substantial increase in the pensions allowed under the existing law. The estimated cost under the prepared bill the first year is over \$22,000,000. The maximum amount per month payable under this bill is \$39 and the minimum amount \$25. On account of the increased cost of all necessities of life, the advanced age of all survivors of the Civil War and their consequent disability, I favor a minimum of \$30 a month and would gladly vote for it. I am aware that the minimum of \$25 per month increases the pension of short-term soldiers about 50 per cent, while the long-term soldiers will get an increase of only about 30 per cent. All men who enlisted and served their country during the Civil War were paid only about \$13 or \$14 per month, while those now serving in the armies of our country are receiving a minimum of \$30 per month and \$15 more for a dependent wife and \$5 to \$8 for dependent children. The Government in addition provides insurance at the rate of \$8 per thousand. The amount now paid is little enough for the services required. Surely the Government, in view of this statement, should provide liberally for these old soldiers and thereby relieve them from anxiety in their declining years.

Mr. NORTON. Did the gentleman say that this was the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. BESH LIN. I understand so.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman has apparently not read the report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Maine. Mr. Speaker, in my portion of the very limited time allowed for the consideration of this bill it is impossible to analyze it and to point out and emphasize what seem to me to be its inadequacies. I resent that the majority should force upon us a parliamentary situation which prevents full and free discussion and forbids offering amendments to increase the rates provided or to eliminate objectionable features from the bill.

The provisions of the bill, the number of persons affected, and the increased appropriation called for by its terms may be summarized as follows:

Section 1 of the bill proposes a minimum rate of \$25 per month to survivors of the Civil War deriving title under any general law or special act and higher monthly rates on the basis of attained ages and lengths of service, as follows:

70 years and service of—	
1 year—	\$25.00
1½ years—	28.00
2 years—	30.00
2½ years—	31.00
3 years or over—	32.50
75 years and service of—	
90 days—	27.00
6 months—	29.00
1 year—	31.00
1½ years—	35.00
2 years or over—	39.00

The latter rate is extended to cases of unfitness for or inability to perform manual labor due to disability of service origin, without regard to length of service or age.

Section 2 proposes increase in general law and special act rates of \$20 per month or more, by multiples of 50 cents, to amounts nearest approximating 30 per cent additional, but with the proviso that no rate shall exceed \$50 per month.

Section 3 withholds the proposed benefits from inmates of State or National soldiers' homes and pensioners whose net annual income from all sources, including pension, is \$1,000 or more.

Application of the terms of sections 1 and 2 of the bill to Civil War survivors on the roll at the close of the last fiscal year at rates of less than \$50 per month affords results as to numbers affected and annual increase in cost as follows:

	Number.	Annual increase.
Increase to \$25 per month—	72,619	\$8,556,077
Increased on account of age and length of service—	223,209	20,159,973
General law and special acts increased 30 per cent—	30,519	2,999,523
Total—	326,347	29,715,573

By the act of October 6, 1917, all widows of soldiers who drew Civil War pensions or had a pensionable status and who married the soldiers prior to June 27, 1905, were granted a pension of \$25 per month. This is not too much, but it is manifestly inequitable that tens of thousands of soldiers still living, many of whom are burdened with dependents, should receive no more than the widows of other soldiers. Our veterans have lived to see and to feel the burden of abnormal prices in all the necessities of life. It is said that the purchasing power of the dollar to-day as compared with May, 1912, is no more than 40 cents on the dollar. It is estimated that this bill will increase the purchasing power of the soldier's pension to about 72 per cent of its purchasing power in 1912. It leaves the pensioners worse off than they were in 1912 with the prices and the pensions then

prevailing. More than 95 per cent of the veterans receiving pensions have little or no income in addition to their pensions. Practically all of them are over 72 years of age. They are passing away at the rate of more than 3,000 each month, and soon all will have answered to the last call. In recognition of this fact and of these changed conditions, this bill should carry a minimum of at least \$30 per month and a maximum based on age and service of not less than \$50 per month. To do less than this is to fail signally in our duty.

Section 3 of the bill, providing that the increases should not be available to those having an income of \$1,000, should be stricken out. Less than 5 per cent of the pensioners have such an income. The retention of this provision in the bill means long delays and vexatious inquiries in every case. I prefer that the small percentage of pensioners having already a living income should enjoy the benefits of this bill than that all our old soldiers should be subjected to the annoyances incident to the administration of such a provision. I am likewise opposed to excluding those in soldiers' homes from the benefits of the law. I do not feel that the veterans who are so unfortunate as to have no homes of their own or who are without those able to care for them should be penalized by exclusion from the benefits of this bill because they have sought entrance to the one refuge open to them.

In spite of the fact that the bill falls far short of my hopes I shall support it, for it will bring some relief to the men whom we owe so much.

"And they came to the gate within the wall, where Peter holds the keys. Stand up, stand up, now, Tomlinson, and answer loud and high, The good that ye did for the sake of men or ever ye came to die— The good that ye did for the sake of men in little earth so lone!— And the naked soul of Tomlinson grew white as a rain-washed bone."

"This I have read in a book," he said, "and that was told to me, And this I have thought that another man thought of a prince in Muscovy."

And Peter twirled the jangling keys in weariness and wrath. "Ye have read, ye have heard, ye have thought," he said, "and the tale is yet to run; By the worth of the body once ye had, give answer—what ha' ye done?"

To such a challenge what answer can we give for the veterans of the Union Army. In our hour of stress as young men they gave up opportunities, careers, homes, and all that men hold dear. They suffered and sacrificed for human rights and the preservation of our Union. All that America is to-day is due to them, and on America hang the hopes of the world.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I had the honor of serving on the Committee on Invalid Pensions of which the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] is the chairman, and who now has charge of this bill before the House. While I served on that committee I made a special study of pension legislation and of the needs of the veterans of the Mexican and Civil Wars. I introduced and got through the committee and Congress a great many special bills for the relief of the old soldiers and the widows and orphans of old soldiers. No service that I have performed here has given me more pleasure than to procure for them this needed and well-merited relief.

In studying the needs of these veterans I came to the conclusion that a general increase in pensions should be granted. Since the Sherwood bill was passed granting a maximum of \$1 per day, conditions have changed. Not only has the dollar lost about half of its purchasing power, but the veterans have grown older, more helpless, and require more to minister to their needs and comfort. The bill before the House grants an increase of 30 per cent. That helps, but it is not enough. December 5 last I introduced a bill (H. R. 6981) granting an increase of \$15 per month over the rates in the Sherwood law of 1912. Since introducing this bill I have received many letters from old soldiers in the district. I have the honor to represent and from at least a dozen different Northern States indorsing my bill.

I regret that under the rules under which this bill is being considered no amendments can be offered. If I had an opportunity to do so, I should offer my bill as a substitute. As the bill now before the House is the only one that can be considered and offers a considerable increase, though not enough, I shall take pleasure in voting for it with the hope that the Senate will grant additional increases. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to have printed H. R. 6981, the bill introduced by me December 5, 1917, and which is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6981) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912, so as to increase certain pensions \$15 per month.

Be it enacted, etc., That the first and second paragraphs of the act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved May 11, 1912, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late Civil War, who has been honorably discharged therefrom, and who has reached the age of 62 years or over, shall, upon making proof of such facts, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the pension roll and be entitled to receive a pension as follows: In case such person has reached the age of 62 years and served 90 days, \$28 per month; six months, \$28.50 per month; one year, \$29 per month; one and a half years, \$29.50 per month; two years, \$30 per month; two and a half years, \$30.50 per month; three years or over, \$31 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 66 years and served 90 days, \$30 per month; six months, \$30.50 per month; one year, \$31 per month; one and a half years, \$31.50 per month; two years, \$32 per month; two and a half years, \$33 per month; three years or over, \$34 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 70 years and served 90 days, \$33 per month; six months, \$34 per month; one year, \$35 per month; one and a half years, \$36.50 per month; two years, \$38 per month; two and a half years, \$39 per month; three years or over, \$40 per month. In case such person has reached the age of 75 years and served 90 days, \$36 per month; six months, \$37.50 per month; one year, \$39 per month; one and a half years, \$42 per month; two years or over, \$45 per month. That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty resulting in his disability is now unable to perform manual labor, shall be paid the maximum pension under this act, to wit, \$45 per month, without regard to length of service or age."

"That any person who has served 60 days or more in the military or naval service of the United States in the War with Mexico, and has been honorably discharged therefrom, shall, upon making like proof of such service, be entitled to receive a pension of \$45 per month."

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this pension measure because it is the best we can get at this time. In both the last Congress and early in this session I introduced a bill providing for \$30 per month flat, regardless of length of service or age. I would rather now vote for that bill, and if I had the opportunity would offer it as an amendment. However, under the circumstances I will support this bill.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted Mr. BROWNING to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS].

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a little more than a year has now passed since that fateful April day when the Congress of the United States declared that a state of war exists between the United States of America and the Imperial German Government. Never in the world's history has a more stupendous task come upon a people; never has the spirit of a free people been aroused so signally, nor has the spirit of a free people ever manifested itself so significantly in terms of such a high-born ideal. During the months that have passed the courage, the ardor, the initiative, and the generous devotion of the people to a sacred cause have found nobler expression than has ever been recorded in the history of nations. Looking about one can not help but be impressed with what the American people have felt, and how they have translated their feelings into action. When war was first declared there were those who doubted the response that would be made, but those who questioned the propriety of entering upon this great war or doubted the wisdom of the step were not long in being convinced that the American people were not only determined that German insolence would no longer be tolerated but that America would take a step forward and declare for world democracy. Never, perhaps, has there been such an exhibition of a people's generous attitude as has been shown in the subscription for billions of liberty bonds, in the indorsement of the project of a selective draft which enrolled 10,000,000 men, and in sanctioning the appropriation of billions of dollars for the support of the Army and Navy and other war-emergency activities.

Within a comparatively short period more than a million men have been assigned to cantonments scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land. These men have been clothed, armed, and equipped, and are being transported to the seat of war as rapidly as circumstances permit. The voluntary agencies which asked for support from the American people met with a response that thrilled the heart and cheered the spirit of every American citizen. Millions of dollars for the Red Cross, for the Young Men's Christian Association, for the Knights of Columbus, and for other organizations were contributed with generous hand.

It is a fine tribute to the spirit of democracy which is unalterably opposed to the doctrine of militarism that it should be able to rally its social and economic forces in so short a time with so little confusion and with such practical unanimity. The spirit of sacrifice has found expression on every hand—whether in the crowded city, with its teeming thousands, or in the thinly populated country places—everywhere the American people have given ready response. Mothers and fathers have dedicated their sons, and wives, with tear-stained eyes, have not counted

the cost too great to submit to long and perhaps timeless separation. From farm and fireside, from store and factory, from city and hamlet, from all the marts of trade, industry, and commerce the legions have come, willing and glad to pay, if necessary, the price of life for the cause of eternal liberty.

And while the men and boys have been massing for active participation, the women of the land have given examples of unparalleled devotion in ministering to the physical needs and comforts of Army and Navy. The future historian will write as one of the significant pages in history that which describes the heroism of the women of the land, who not only gave their sons and husbands and brothers but organized aid, comfort, and relief on a scale such as never has been paralleled in the annals of time. All that has been done, all that will be done, and all that can be done is but the latent spirit of a free people expressed for the purpose of perpetuating the doctrine of individual liberty. It will ever be the crowning glory of America that in the year 1776 she began the work of putting kings out of commission. Since that time the business of being a king by Divine right has had a precarious existence, and when the final blow of the struggle in which we are now engaged is struck the autocratic king business will be dead and damned beyond the hope of a political or civil resurrection. The one clear dominating note above the "tumult and the shouting" is that which proclaims the right of every nation to say how it will be governed and the right of every human being to be a participant in the government that holds its protecting flag over him. Such is the purpose of America in the war, and in the attainment of that purpose we shall not falter or fail while the American spirit so manifest now renders tribute to its ideals and traditions.

But while we contemplate with satisfaction the splendid spirit of America's millions of patriotic and self-sacrificing men and women, we must not close our eyes to the fact that within our borders there exists an element not openly and avowedly disloyal, but secretly intent on undermining the principles upon which the superstructure of our cause rests. By a most insidious propaganda that element sows the seeds of sedition, encourages proselyting, disseminates false news, disuades people from subscribing to loans, lays plots to destroy our munition plants, and in a hundred devious ways give aid and comfort to the enemy. The Government in its treatment of this disaffected element has exercised a leniency that has reached its limits. There is now no middle ground. Every inhabitant of the United States is either for or against the Government. The people have spoken and they demand that those who in secret traduce the Government by plot and intrigue shall be treated as enemies of the State and be summarily dealt with. It is the blindest of follies to tolerate any form of treasonable conduct within our household at any time. Much greater is the folly when the masses of the people in a nation are staking their lifeblood and treasure in a crisis that imperils human freedom. A neutral citizen in the United States to-day is an anachronism. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are vouchsafed to him who stands by the flag and what it represents. Patriotism can have no dual personality; treason alone is the hydra-headed monster. The cause is too sacred, the issue too momentous to tolerate longer in any community those who by insidious arts and schemes would prey upon the vitals of the country. And if I sense aright the spirit of the people, they demand that the severest penalties should be imposed upon those who would jeopardize the success of our Army and Navy. To suffer enemy plotters in this country to poison liberty at its very fountain head is to trifle with the tolerant and patient spirit of the people. To impose mild Federal imprisonment or internment may well accord with judicial sanction in time of peace, but treason in time of war demands a sterner retribution. To strike a swift and sure blow now will serve to show that the traitor and his treasonable conduct can have no abiding place in this Republic.

I have been profoundly impressed with the fine ardor and splendid spirit manifested among the people whom I represent. Everywhere I have found them loyal, hopeful, considerate. From every roof tree flies the service flag. The daughters of the communities are in the Red Cross organizations, the mothers helpful in the clubs and at the firesides, the sons in the trenches, the fathers on the farms and in the factories, each doing not merely his "bit," but his very best. What is being done among my own people I have a feeling is being done in varied and varying degrees in every congressional district throughout this broad land. Who can escape the sense of pride when he contemplates his country, 100,000,000 strong, definitely pledged to break the tyranny of autocracy and committed to enthrone the ideal of free government in the hearts and consciences of humanity. The cause is a sacred one, and the American people will justify themselves in their splendid support of all measures

that tend to eliminate distinctions and strengthen the bonds of universal brotherhood.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have yielded to other gentlemen practically all of the time I happen to have control of because I wanted to emphasize the view I have always entertained, that where a gentleman by reason of his committee status or otherwise happens to be fortunate enough to control some of the time for debate he ought to realize that it belongs to his colleagues, and that he ought not try to hog it himself. I shall utilize the little time I have left for the purpose of saying one or two things that I shall elaborate on at a later date under the leave which I have obtained heretofore to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this question. In common with a number of my colleagues on this side of the House who have spoken on this bill, I wish to state that I would be glad to have the opportunity of voting for an amendment to the bill fixing the minimum pension at \$30 a month. The RECORD will show that ever since I became a Member of this body I have contended for such a law. We have talked for all these years about a dollar-a-day pension bill and many soldiers were led to believe that they had it, only to discover later that they had been misled. I am not going to indulge in any criticism of the majority that is not just and fair, but it is no answer to the argument that we ought to have a chance to vote for amendments to liberalize this bill, to say that in times past and under entirely different conditions the Republican Party brought up pension bills under a suspension of the rules, as has been done to-day. I might add in this connection that the amendments that gentlemen desired to offer to the Sulloway bill, which has been referred to frequently in this debate, were not designed to liberalize the bill, as we are seeking to do to-day, so that the fact that the Republicans, when they controlled the House, invoked a suspension of the rules does not show any unfriendliness to the old soldier, as the proceedings of the majority here to-day do show.

As I recall it, the Grand Army of the Republic and the soldiers of the country were satisfied with the Sulloway bill, and did not want it amended, while according to the best information I can get as to their attitude on this bill they do want it amended in some particulars. I have not the remotest doubt that if we could get the privilege of offering an amendment providing a minimum of \$30 a month this House would adopt it with an overwhelming vote. The old soldiers of the country and their friends will not fail to note that with complete unanimity the Republicans of this body have to-day sought in every parliamentary way to get a chance to liberalize this bill, and that these efforts have been uniformly blocked by gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House. My genial friend from Ohio [Mr. KEX] suggested a while ago that the action of the recent conference of the Republican Members of the House approving the Smoot bill is responsible for the partisanship and acrimony which has developed in this debate. Of course I take it that the Democrats of the House have never been guilty of similar action. I am unable to understand how the decision of the Republican Members of the House, that they favored the Smoot bill, which is a more liberal bill than this one, stirred up our Democratic friends and invoked partisan discussion, if it be true, as some of them contend, that the Democratic Party is friendlier to the old soldiers than the Republican Party. Of course, everyone who is at all familiar with the history of pension legislation knows that such a contention is absurd.

My distinguished friend from Missouri, Judge RUCKER, who is always eloquent and usually fair in debate, referred to the Sherwood Act of May 11, 1912, as an evidence of the friendliness of the Democratic Party to the veterans of the Civil War. I have not the time to go into an analysis of the vote on that bill, but I beg to remind the House that with 225 Democratic Members of this body at that time, only 97 Democratic votes were cast for the bill, while practically the entire Republican vote was cast for it.

An analysis of the vote shows that but for the loyal and unwavering support which it received at the hands of the Republican membership the bill would have been overwhelmingly defeated in the House of its alleged friends. The vote in the Senate was of a similar character, and the vote in both Houses on that bill shows unmistakably and unanswerably, as I have heretofore said in this body, that the Republican Party as an organization has been the constant advocate and loyal supporter of liberal pensions for those who fought under the Stars and Stripes in every conflict in which our flag has been carried, and that the Democratic Party as an organization, with here and there an exception, has been, particularly since the Civil War, against liberal pension legislation. And mark this prediction, gentlemen, and I am willing to renounce all claims to the gift of prophecy if I miss it: I predict that there will be a lot

of Democratic votes against this bill, which vote would be considerably larger but for the political exigencies involved, and that there will not be a single Republican vote cast against it.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I do not believe my colleague from Indiana, Mr. BLAND, intended to question the loyalty to the old soldiers of Ohio's grand old man, Gen. SHERWOOD, and I think the language that the gentleman used was in the heat of debate, more or less perverted for one purpose or another. I have served for many years on the Invalid Pensions Committee with Gen. SHERWOOD, and I am glad to say that I do not think the soldiers of the country have a more faithful or a more loyal friend in this body than he. [Applause.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak or who have spoken on this bill be granted leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken upon this bill or who may speak upon it be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, a great many gentlemen have not had the opportunity of speaking on this bill who would like to, and I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you and the House for the short time allowed me to express my approval of pensions for our veteran soldiers.

May I be permitted to say at the outset, if there ever was a policy to which the United States was fully committed it is the policy of liberal pensions for our veteran soldiers?

Abraham Lincoln had their welfare at heart, and it was he who stated that this country should devote itself to binding up the wounds of the afflicted and caring for the widows and orphans of our veteran soldiers. Schuyler Colfax was likewise a sincere friend to the veteran soldiers and favored pensions as a war policy. And, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to state that as a reward for valuable services this Nation owes a debt to its veteran soldiers which can not be paid alone in gratuity, but in rewarding them in part for the sacrifices they endured and the services they performed.

Indeed we would have no united Nation to-day if it had not been for the veteran soldier. Probably the lesson of their sacrifices in enlisting is brought home closer to us to-day than it was before the present European world war started.

Now, we see young men not only leaving home and everything dear to them, but also leaving behind opportunities of making a success in business pursuits, just as the soldiers of the Civil War did. Many of them give up their hope of education, quit their studies, close the college door, and exchange their books of learning for a knapsack and rifle to learn the art of war.

We are at war. There is no use of evading that fact. Every man who formerly was for peace should now be for war. The very life of our country and its institutions are at stake, as well as the safety of our homes and the welfare of our families.

We may learn a lesson from heroic, patriotic, and noble Belgium. Its people made the supreme sacrifice. Few Belgians are now living in that desolated country. Those who are able to work were driven by the Hun hordes into bondage, to make munitions, to raise food, and some of them to serve under penalty of death in the German military establishment. What a scene! What a sacrifice Belgium made! Are we now less patriotic or strong in heart?

It is a long way from peace to a war basis; but we must devote ourselves wholly to war until victory comes. Our sons and young men have gone to war. The morale of our people and the fighting disposition of our people must support them. We must do everything we can here at home in this country to encourage and support them. Spies must be hung, traitors must be shot, sedition must be quelled. Unity of purpose and unity of action there must be. We are fighting a terrible war—one-half of the world against the other half—but with right-

eousness and justice upon our side, surely as the sun shines in the sky, we will be victorious in the end.

May I further say that I have always favored a dollar-a-day pension for the veteran soldiers? I think that is little enough. In my first campaign I spoke in favor of the Sherwood dollar-a-day pension bill and voted for it here in the House. That bill passed the House, but was amended by the McCumber amendment in the Senate to a double standard age and service bill, allowing pensions according to the time of service and age of the veteran. I think the time has now come when every veteran who served in the Army of the United States and offered his life for his country should be put on the pension roll. I likewise believe that every veteran soldier who is in humble circumstances and not able to earn a livelihood and needing frequent and periodic attention ought to receive a pension sufficient to support him and furnish him medical care and attendance in order that he might not be reduced to want and have the thought of poverty haunting him or on his mind in his last days.

I am pleased that this bill makes a horizontal increase of 30 per cent over the amount of the pension now received by the soldier. The increased cost of living makes an increase of the pension absolutely necessary; and while 30 per cent increase in his pension will not meet half the increase now in the cost of living, it will help some and be a recognition for the valuable services performed by him in the dark and perilous hours of our Nation.

When the boys enlisted—for they were mere boys—they were told that they and their dependents would be cared for by the Nation, and I am pleased to see this promise being kept. I think the provision of the bill stating that any soldier who has an income of \$1,000 a year should not be entitled to an increase should be stricken from the bill. And if the lowest pension granted to any soldier was \$1 a day I would be more pleased in giving my support to it. But it is the best we can do. The bill comes under a rule curtailing debate and allowing no amendments, so that in the House all we can do is to pass it as it is.

It is stated on the floor of the House by Gen. SHERWOOD, chairman of the Invalid Pension Committee, that this bill has the favor, support, and recommendation of many posts of the Grand Army of the Republic of the United States. He presents many letters in support of this contention. I have no doubt but that this bill carries the indorsement of a large majority of the Grand Army of the Republic of our Nation, although I wish they had made the minimum pension \$30 instead of \$25.

Mr. Speaker, let me voice my appreciation of the manner of providing for our present soldiers fighting in the great European war by giving them an insurance policy of \$10,000 at the low rate of practically \$7 per month. In case of death this amount is paid to their dependents. In case of injury they draw an amount approximating \$60 per month. This takes care of the pension situation for our present Army. Those not injured contribute to those who are injured, and under it ample provision is made for our soldiers against want and privation.

Our glorious country is now passing through the shadow of the greatest war of our history. Let every man who remains at home do his duty as well as the boys at the front are doing theirs, and our flag will continue to wave over the land of the free; our Nation, with its many opportunities, and our homes, with their pleasing hearthstones, will be forever secure and safe in the years to come against any tyrant and all barbarians. [Applause.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for six minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to no man in this House in friendship for the old soldier. I have sometimes said that it would be a disgrace to this Government to permit any of the old veterans of the Civil War to go to the poorhouse or suffer for the necessities of life. I feel so now. This bill provides for a 30 per cent increase of all pensions now paid to Union soldiers of the Civil War, which is necessary and justified by the present high cost of living, and I hope it will be promptly passed.

I am sorry to see that there is some disposition on the part of some of the gentlemen in this House to inject politics into this discussion to-day. I served in this House while the Republicans were in power, and during that time two general pension laws were passed. We are assailed here to-day because this bill comes up under suspension of the rules. Of the two pension bills that were passed by the Republican Party while they were in power, during the time that I served in this House, one of them was the increase of the widow's pension from \$8 to \$12 per month. That was passed on February 3, 1908. It was taken up and passed under suspension of the rules, just as this bill is to be passed to-day.

Efforts were made to amend it without avail. It was a privileged bill, as this is. You had in the chair at that time the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], whom we all respect, and I know him to be a friend of the soldier and of the soldiers' widows at all times. You were asked to-day why we did not call this bill up as a privileged bill and pass it in that way? Why did not the Republicans call up the widows' bill as a privileged bill and pass it? Because they wanted it passed as it was brought into the House by the committee and did not want to throw it open to amendment. Another bill was passed while the Republicans were in power, while I was a Member. That was the Sulloway bill. It was passed on January 10, 1911. The same conditions exactly obtained at that time. It was brought up under suspension of the rules. It was a privileged bill. You had a friend in the chair, but you did not call it up as a privileged bill. You brought it up under suspension of the rules, as we have done with this bill to-day. An effort was made by no less distinguished a man than the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. WEEKS, then a Member of the House, to amend it, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER], who had charge of the bill, objected, and no amendment was permitted at that time. Why do you censure us to-day for doing what the Republicans did all the time while they were in power? I call attention to the fact that the Sulloway bill, the purpose of which was to pay pensions to all soldiers of the Civil War, although passed in this House, was defeated in the Senate, and never while the Republican Party was in power did you give the old soldiers of this country any relief, but it was the Democratic Congress that first passed the Sherwood bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This was the first general pension bill that provided pensions for all the soldiers of the Civil War who fought for the preservation of the Union. I do not deny that you Republicans are now friendly to the old soldiers, but the fact remains that after long years of political power you failed to give them relief, but the Democratic Party promptly did so by the passage of the Sherwood bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not the time. After that bill was passed by a Democratic House it was cut down in amount by a Republican Senate, and now they tell us that the Senate will have to improve this bill by giving us the Smoot bill. The Senate never did improve a pension bill that was sent to it by this House. [Laughter and applause.] The Sulloway bill was defeated entirely, and the Sherwood bill was largely reduced. Is not that true?

Mr. LANGLEY. Will not the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; for a short question.

Mr. LANGLEY. All right. Is it not a fact that there were 225 Democrats in the House when the Sherwood bill was passed, and they only gave 97 votes, and that every Republican in the House who voted was recorded for that bill? I have reference to the record.

Mr. RUSSELL. My friend from Kentucky is mistaken. When the Sherwood bill was passed such distinguished Republicans as Payne of New York and Hill of Connecticut and Gardner and McCall of Massachusetts all voted against it, and when the Sulloway bill was passed by the House the Republican leader on the floor, Mr. Payne, made a speech against it; and the present Republican leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], Senator WEEKS, of Massachusetts, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] all spoke against it.

Mr. LANGLEY. Is not the gentleman talking about the Sulloway bill? I am speaking from recollection. I know nearly all of them voted for it, and I thought they all did.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know how many Republicans voted for it. I know it is quite a habit of Republicans to make speeches against bills and then vote for them. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] They may have done it in this case. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARNER. Is it not probable that a great many regrets have been expressed here to-day while entertaining the hope that the bill will pass as it is?

Mr. RUSSELL. Absolutely. There is no Republican in this House to-day who will vote against this bill. I am satisfied of that. They know it is a good bill, and yet they have undertaken to try to criticize the bill and chastise us for trying to suspend the rules so as to get it through promptly.

I was surprised when my friend from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] said that all the credit of getting this bill up in the House to-day is due to the tireless efforts of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] because he agitated the question on the floor last Saturday. Why, God bless you, my friends, the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD and Mr. ASHBROOK] and myself had already before that time gone to the Speaker of this House, who is a friend of the old soldier, and I had promised

us before last Saturday that he would recognize Gen. SHERWOOD to-day to do just what we have done. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Nebraska rise?

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, to submit a unanimous-consent request. I have an amendment on the Clerk's desk, and I ask to have it read and acted upon, providing for the reduction of the time of service from 90 days to 30 days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to offer an amendment—

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I regret not to accommodate the gentleman from Nebraska, but I think we had better vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana makes the point of order there is no quorum present, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] A hundred and fifty-six gentlemen, not a quorum, are present. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. Will the vote be now upon the passage of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspension of the rules and the passage of the bill. Those in favor will vote "aye" and those opposed will vote "no."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 46, answered "present" 2, not voting 140, as follows:

YEAS—242.

Alexander	Esch	Linthicum	Sanford
Anderson	Evans	Littlepage	Scott, Iowa
Anthony	Fairchild, B. L.	Lobeck	Scott, Mich.
Ashbrook	Ferris	London	Scully
Austin	Fess	Loneragan	Sears
Ayres	Fisher	Luffkin	Sells
Baer	Flood	Lundeen	Shallenberger
Barkley	Focht	Lunn	Sherwood
Barnhart	Foster	McAndrews	Shouse
Beakes	Francis	McArthur	Sims
Beshlin	Frear	McClintic	Sinnott
Black	Freeman	McFadden	Sloan
Bland	French	McKenzie	Smail
Booher	Fuller, Ill.	McKeown	Smith, Idaho
Britten	Fuller, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Browne	Gallivan	McLemore	Smith, C. B.
Browning	Gandy	Madden	Snell
Brumbaugh	Garnier	Magee	Snook
Burnett	Garrett, Tenn.	Mapes	Snyder
Butler	Gillett	Mason	Stafford
Caldwell	Glynn	Mays	Stedman
Campbell, Kans.	Godwin, N. C.	Merritt	Steenerson
Cannon	Graham, Ill.	Miller, Minn.	Stephens, Nebr.
Caraway	Graham, Pa.	Miller, Wash.	Sterling, Ill.
Carter, Okla.	Green, Iowa	Moon	Sterling, Pa.
Cary	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Ind.	Stevenson
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Vt.	Morgan	Stines
Chandler, Okla.	Hadley	Nelson	Strong
Clark, Fla.	Hamilton, Mich.	Nichols, Mich.	Switzer
Classon	Hamlin	Norton	Talbot
Claypool	Hardy	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Coady	Hastings	Olney	Thomas
Cooper, Ohio	Hawley	Osborne	Tillman
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayden	O'Shaunessy	Tilson
Cooper, Wis.	Heaton	Overmyer	Timberlake
Copley	Helvering	Padgett	Towner
Crago	Hensley	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Cramton	Hersey	Parker, N. Y.	Van Dyke
Crisp	Hicks	Peters	Vestal
Crosser	Hilliard	Platt	Volgt
Dallinger	Holland	Polk	Volstead
Davidson	Huddleston	Pou	Walsh
Decker	Hull, Iowa	Pratt	Walton
Delaney	Igoe	Price	Ward
Dempsey	Ireland	Purnell	Wason
Denton	James	Rainey, H. T.	Watkins
Dickinson	Johnson, Ky.	Rainey, J. W.	Watson, Va.
Dill	Johnson, Wash.	Raker	Webb
Dixon	Kearns	Ramseyer	Welty
Doolittle	Keating	Reed	Wheeler
Doremus	Kehoe	Robbins	White, Me.
Doughton	Kennedy, Iowa	Roberts	White, Ohio
Dowell	Key, Ohio	Rodenberg	Williams
Drane	Kless, Pa.	Rogers	Wilson, Ill.
Dyer	Kinkaid	Romjue	Winslow
Eagan	Kitchin	Rubey	Wood, Ind.
Elliot	Knutson	Russell	Woods, Iowa
Ellsworth	Kraus	Sabath	Woodyard
Elston	La Follette	Sanders, Ind.	Young, N. Dak.
Emerson	Langley		

NAYS—46.

Almon	Dominick	Oliver, Ala.	Sumners
Aswell	Dupré	Overstreet	Taylor, Ark.
Bankhead	Eagle	Park	Venable
Bell	Garrett, Tex.	Quin	Vinson
Blackmon	Goodwin, Ark.	Rayburn	Walker
Blanton	Gordon	Rouse	Weaver
Brand	Heflin	Rucker	Whaley
Buchanan	Helm	Sherley	Wise
Byrnes, S. C.	Houston	Sisson	Wright
Candler, Miss.	Kincheloe	Slayden	Young, Tex.
Collier	Larsen	Steagall	
Connally, Tex.	Mansfield	Stephens, Miss.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Byrns, Tenn. Wilson, Tex.

NOT VOTING—140.

Bacharach	Fields	Kelley, Mich.	Powers
Borland	Flynn	Kelly, Pa.	Ragsdale
Bowers	Fordney	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey
Brodbeck	Foss	Kettner	Rankin
Burroughs	Gallagher	King	Reavis
Campbell, Pa.	Gard	Kreider	Riordan
Cantrill	Garland	LaGuardia	Robinson
Carew	Glass	Lazaro	Rose
Carlin	Good	Lea, Cal.	Rowe
Carter, Mass.	Goodall	Lee, Ga.	Rowland
Church	Gould	Lehlbach	Sanders, La.
Clark, Pa.	Gray, Ala.	Leshner	Sanders, N. Y.
Cleary	Gray, N. J.	Lever	Saunders, Va.
Connelly, Kans.	Gregg	Little	Schall
Costello	Griest	Longworth	Scott, Pa.
Currie, Mich.	Griffin	McCormick	Shackelford
Curry, Cal.	Hamill	McCulloch	Siegel
Dale, N. Y.	Hamilton, N. Y.	McKinley	Slomp
Dale, Vt.	Harrison, Miss.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Smith, T. F.
Darrow	Harrison, Va.	Maher	Steele
Davis	Haskell	Mann	Sullivan
Denison	Haugen	Martin	Sweet
Dent	Heintz	Meeker	Swift
Dewalt	Hollingsworth	Mondell	Tague
Dies	Hood	Montague	Temple
Dillon	Howard	Moore, Pa.	Templeton
Donovan	Hull, Tenn.	Morin	Thompson
Dooling	Humphreys	Mott	Tinkham
Drukker	Husted	Mudd	Vare
Dunn	Hutchinson	Nicholls, S. C.	Waldow
Edmonds	Jacoway	Nolan	Watson, Pa.
Estopinal	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver, N. Y.	Wellington
Fairchild, G. W.	Jones	Palge	Wilson, La.
Fairfield	Juul	Phelan	Wingo
Farr	Kahn	Porter	Zihlman

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. REAVIS.
 Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. STEELE with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. WALDOW.
 Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. BURROUGHS.
 Mr. FIELDS with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. BACHARACH.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. CURRY of California.
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. ZIHLMAN.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. BOWERS.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. DARROW.
 Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CLEARY with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. DENISON.
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. FAIRFIELD.
 Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas with Mr. EDMONDS.
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. DUNN.
 Mr. CHURCH with Mr. CURRIE of Michigan.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. MUDD.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. FARR.
 Mr. LAZARO with Mr. KING.
 Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. MEEKER.
 Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. FOSS.
 Mr. PHELAN with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. GARLAND.
 Mr. GARD with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. HAUGEN.
 Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. MCCULLOCH.
 Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. JUUL.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. LEA of California with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. HULL of Tennessee with Mr. LEHLBACH.
 Mr. LESHER with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. HUMPHREYS with Mr. LITTLE.

Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. MCKINLEY.
 Mr. LEVER with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. HOOD with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. GREGG with Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. MONDELL.
 Mr. MARTIN with Mr. TEMPLE.
 Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. PAIGE.
 Mr. SHACKLEFORD with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. RAMSEY.
 Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Miss RANKIN.
 Mr. TAGUE with Mr. ROSE.
 Mr. THOMPSON with Mr. SANDERS of New York.
 Mr. WELLING with Mr. SWIFT.
 Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. WINGO with Mr. SWEET.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. SCHALL with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. NOLAN, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. DALE of Vermont, is absent, making patriotic speeches. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania is absent. If he were present, I am authorized to say, he would vote "yea."

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. DILLON, is unavoidably detained at home. If he were here, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. FORDNEY, is necessarily and unavoidably absent, and I am authorized to say that if he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. KELLEY of Michigan, is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas, for 10 days, on account of important business; and

To Mr. FAIRFIELD (at the request of Mr. VESTAL), for 10 days, to attend the funeral of his mother.

AGE OF CANDIDATES FOR NAVAL ACADEMY.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3402), to fix the age limit for candidates for admission to the United States Naval Academy.

The title was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I understood the gentleman withdrew it the other day for the purpose of offering an amendment. I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has any amendment which he wishes to offer?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. I wanted to offer an amendment, in lines 4 and 5, to strike out the words "between the ages of 16 and 20 years on July," and ask unanimous consent in lieu thereof to insert "not less than 16 years of age nor more than 20 years of age on April," so that it will read:

That hereafter all candidates for admission to the Naval Academy must be not less than 16 years of age nor more than 20 years of age on April 1 of the calendar year in which they enter the academy.

Mr. GILLET. How does that change it from the present law?

Mr. PADGETT. I was going to state it. At present we have two laws on the subject of nominees made by Senators and Members of the House, and they provide that they must not be less than 16 nor more than 20 at the date of the examination.

Now, they hold two examinations every year and sometimes three. The examinations are usually held in February and April. The law with reference to admission from the service provides for another date for entering the academy, so that there are varying dates. This is simply to leave the age limit the same and to fix April 1 as the date of determining the age. I selected April 1 because at present the practice is to hold examinations in February and in April. They hold them sometimes, I think, about the first or second Tuesday in April.

Mr. STAFFORD. Always the third Tuesday of February and the third Tuesday of April.

Mr. PADGETT. So that this is a fair mean between those two examination dates.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understand the present age limit is 22 years. Why the discrimination? Why limit it to 20 years?

Mr. PADGETT. The question has been before the committee a number of times, and all the naval people have advocated reducing the age to 18, making it 15 to 18, claiming that the younger ones adapt themselves to the service far better than the older ones. But we have kept the age the same and are proposing to have the 1st of April fixed as the definite date for the entry.

Mr. CANNON. It does not apply to this year?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. KEARNS. The maximum is 20 years?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; the maximum is 20 years. This does not affect that now.

Mr. KEARNS. You say there is a movement on foot to reduce it to 15 years?

Mr. PADGETT. I say it has been advocated before the committee for several years, but the committee has never recommended reducing the age.

Mr. KEARNS. I understand in the last examination scarcely any of the boys who were high-school boys passed the examination. I am speaking of the April examination.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not heard anything about the April examination. That was not the case with respect to the February examination.

Mr. KEARNS. I was told that the April examination was the most difficult one they have had in years. If a boy 18 years old could not pass it, I do not know how a boy 15 years old could.

Mr. PADGETT. We have not advocated placing the age at 15.

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter all candidates for admission to the Naval Academy must be between the ages of 16 and 20 years on July 1 of the calendar year in which they enter the academy: Provided, That the foregoing shall not apply to candidates for midshipmen designated for entrance to the academy in 1918.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 1, lines 4 and 5, after the word "be," in line 4, strike out "between the ages of 16 and 20 years on July," and insert "not less than 16 years of age or more than 20 years of age on April," so that the bill as amended will read:

"That hereafter all candidates for admission to the Naval Academy must be not less than 16 years of age or more than 20 years of age on April 1 of the calendar year in which they enter the academy," etc.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the proposition? What age limit is being fixed?

Mr. PADGETT. It is not changing the age limit. This fixes a definite date to determine the age.

Mr. MADDEN. They must be from 16 to 20 now when they make an application. This is for the examination?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. This is when the examination is held. One is held in April and one in February, and sometimes they hold them in June. In another law as to those who come in from the service it is the date of entering the academy. This is to determine a uniform time for entry.

Mr. MADDEN. So that if a young man were appointed, for example, in March for examination in April, and he was 20 years of age on the 1st of May he would not be admitted?

Mr. PADGETT. He would be admitted. He would have to be 20 years of age prior to the 1st day of April.

Mr. MADDEN. Suppose a young man became 20 years of age on the 1st of April, and I was not able to appoint him for the April examination and wanted to appoint him for the June examination?

Mr. PADGETT. We do not regularly have June examinations. They are very rare. We have had only one June examination in a number of years past.

Mr. MADDEN. They examine them specially in June. I have had it done.

Mr. PADGETT. They may be special examinations.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not say regular examinations. What would happen to a boy in that case?

Mr. PADGETT. If he were over 20 years of age on the 1st day of April he could not enter, and if he were under that he would enter. It only fixes a definite date, whereas now we have a fluctuating, varying date, according to the examination and then under two different laws.

Mr. MADDEN. What advantage is there in the new scheme?

Mr. PADGETT. The department says it will save an immense amount of misunderstanding and confusion all over the country, and will save them a vast amount of correspondence explaining the situation from time to time.

Mr. MADDEN. What misunderstanding could they have, for example, if I were going to nominate a young man for examination to the Naval Academy? I would ascertain all the facts in the case and would know whether the young man was within the prescribed age, and I would not nominate him if he were not. How would that affect the department?

Mr. PADGETT. It affects the department by people writing to the department from all over the country as to when a young man can enter.

Mr. MADDEN. But the people have nothing to do with the appointment.

Mr. PADGETT. I know; but the people have an interest in knowing about it, and they write to the department asking as to eligibility and age, and the department writes replies and tells them it is between the ages of 16 and 20, and then they want to know when that 16 and 20 is to be determined.

Mr. MADDEN. That would determine itself, would it not?

Mr. PADGETT. It would determine itself if you had reference to a time fixed to determine it. For instance, if a young man is more than 20 years of age in February, he would be too old.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, nobody would appoint him.

Mr. PADGETT. But if he came to take the examination in April he would not be too old if he attempted to take it in February, but he would be young enough to take it in April if he were 20 years of age a day or two after the examination.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the enactment of this law prevent people from writing to the department?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. It just gives a definite date and leaves a great deal more to be explained.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think it will make a bit of difference about the annoyance to the department, if they consider it an annoyance when the people in the country ask them questions. Of course, you can not account for what military and naval people think is an annoyance. Ordinarily people in the public service, like Members of Congress and others in the civil branches of the Government, do not consider it any annoyance to have people ask questions; but as a rule naval officers and those in the military branch of the service, whenever you ask a question, say, "What are you interfering in this thing for?" They really seem to think they are omnipotent and that we are here by suffrage, and that we are just necessary nuisances with whom they have to put up during the period of the congressional session. Of course, if they feel that way about a Member of Congress, I do not wonder that they feel annoyed when a citizen asks them a question.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I want to move an amendment to the amendment by changing April 1 to July 1. That is practically the time of admission to the academy, and I do not see why it is not the better date.

Mr. PADGETT. The department recommended July 1, and I had it July 1 in the original bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PLATT moves to amend the amendment by striking out the word "April" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "July."

Mr. PADGETT. That was in the original bill, but when it was discussed here the other day you will remember it appeared that the effect will be to shorten the term instead of to lengthen it. I think we had better leave it April.

Mr. PLATT. What is the reason for making it April?

Mr. PADGETT. It simply extends the benefit of the time from July to April.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, will not a vote in favor of the Platt amendment be the same as a vote against the Padgett amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Just exactly.

Mr. PLATT. I understand this is to make uniform the different dates of admission—to make the law uniform?

Mr. PADGETT. The department submitted July, and the committee reported July, but when we had the discussion here the other day it appeared that it would be more accommodating to have it April; and as a result of the discussion here, to adapt it to the trend of opinion at that time, I have suggested April.

Mr. PLATT. That is to give three months longer to each applicant.

Mr. PADGETT. No; the effect of it is that if you put it in July you shorten the time.

Mr. PLATT. I understand that.

Mr. PADGETT. You shorten the age limit within which a man may enter.

Mr. PLATT. That is what the Navy Department want to do.

Mr. PADGETT. I know; they suggested July, but we thought we ought not to reduce the 20 years. So we are making it April, which leaves it practically 20 years, as the law now exists.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield three minutes to me?

Mr. PADGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this matter was considered at some length on the last Unanimous Consent Calendar day. The chairman of the committee withdrew the bill for the purpose of providing for the hiatus which the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] would create and for this reason: There are some instances where boys have been selected for next year's appointments who become 20 years of age after the third Tuesday in April. Now, the amendment of the gentleman from New York would absolutely preclude those boys from taking the examination, because on July 1 they would be more than 20 years of age, but they would not be 20 years of age on April 1. There are some cases where boys have been preparing, mayhap for years, to take this examination, and to pass this bill with the proposed amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] would absolutely preclude them, because while under existing law they are now privileged to take the examination if they are not 20 on the third Tuesday in April, if they become 20 between the third Tuesday in April and the 1st of July, as proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from New York, they would be excluded. Certainly the gentleman does not intend that.

Mr. PLATT. But the law at present provides that.

Mr. PADGETT. I hope the amendment to the amendment will not be agreed to, but that the date, April 1, will be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

The amendment to the amendment of Mr. PLATT was rejected.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, it does not seem to me that there is any sense in the passage of such a law as this, not a bit. It does not do any good, and it may do a lot of harm. Every Member of Congress who has the power to nominate a boy for admission to the Naval Academy knows that under the law the boy is not eligible unless he is between the ages of 16 and 20, anyhow. Now, why fix a definite date when he must have reached the age limit? We might select a man for admission to the Naval Academy for examination in June. We might select him for an examination in January, or in February, or for examination in April, or at any time, but we all know that when we do select him he must be within the age limit. The fixing of a definite date when he must have reached the age limit will work a great hardship in many cases. Men may by the passage of this law be excluded from the possibility of getting into the Naval Academy at all; and if the only purpose of the enactment of the law is to prevent an annoyance to those who are paid by the Government of the United States to answer the questions of the citizens of the United States, it ought not to be enacted. They are in office for the purpose of transacting the public business, and they ought to consider it a pleasure and a privilege to answer questions asked by citizens of the United States. I know of no person so humble, anywhere in America, that I would not be glad to answer if they appealed to me for information, if I had the information. I do not want ever to consider myself so important that I will become annoyed by being asked a question.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Under the law as it is now, the Member nominates a candidate for midshipman and the boy becomes 16 years of age before admission, he can be admitted?

Mr. MADDEN. Any time he is nominated, if within the age limit.

Mr. RAKER. Before he enters the academy?

Mr. MADDEN. Any person who has sense enough to nominate the boy for admission to the Naval Academy certainly has sense enough to know whether he is within the age limit. What I want to impress upon the gentleman and others is the fact that Members of Congress are supposed to have enough sense to know when a man is within the age limit, and not to nominate him unless he is within that limit. I have no patience with men who sit in these swivel chairs in the Navy Department who are annoyed because somebody asks them questions for information. You do not very often get information when you do

ask for it, anyhow. Most of the time they send you back one of those old-time printed slips, with somebody's name at the bottom of it, giving you information generations old instead of answering the question you asked. And then you do not always get that. Sometimes it is two or three weeks after you have written your letter. I got a letter the other day in reply to one I sent on the 26th of March. I got my answer on the 4th of May. It did not give me any information then. When I called up to find out why it took six weeks to write a letter that did not give the information, they said they were trying to find out what the reply should be, and they did not succeed in that. So I say that legislation of this kind ought not to be brought up in the House for consideration. Leave it to the good judgment of the Member of Congress who is authorized to nominate and let him decide when the boy is eligible and when he is not, and not leave it to some man in the Navy Department to say whether the Member of Congress has properly performed his duties. I am opposed to any such legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have stated heretofore the purpose of this bill. We have conflicting legislation, and this is simply to give uniform time so that everybody can act upon it. The gentleman's own statement answers the question. Under the law as it is now, if Members of Congress nominate, the law says the candidate must be between the ages of 18 and 20 at the date of examination. Now, in one year that is one day and in another year it is a different day. It varies. If a man goes in from the service, it says that he must be between the ages of 16 and 20 at the time he enters the academy.

All that this does is to say that he must be between the ages of 16 and 20 on the 1st day of April of the year in which he enters the academy. Examinations have been held in February and in April, and if the 1st day of April is fixed, it is a fair date with reference to nominations by a Member of Congress. It does not change the age limit at all, but the change is from July to April for the reason that it would give the benefit of the difference between April and July in the age limit in favor of the boy entering.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. KINKAID. Does the bill as worded apply to candidates entering next year?

Mr. PADGETT. It says that it does not apply to the present year.

Mr. FREEMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. FREEMAN. Why not fix it on the third Tuesday of April, because the candidate for next year may become 20 between April 1 and the third Tuesday of April?

Mr. PADGETT. We have to have some date. We had it July at first, and then we fixed it the 1st of April, because we thought it would give a better chance for the boys.

Mr. FREEMAN. A Member may have a candidate in view to appoint next year who will become 20 between the 1st day of April and the third Tuesday of April.

Mr. HASTINGS. He would be eligible under this act. If he was under that age on April 1 of next year, it would not exclude him.

Mr. PLATT. Would not exclude those who become 20 between April 1 and the third Tuesday.

Mr. HASTINGS. On April 1, if he is under 20, he would go into the academy.

Mr. HICKS. I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question, not exactly pertinent to this subject but one in which I think the House would be interested. Why the distinction between the age limit in the Military Academy and in the Naval Academy?

Mr. PADGETT. It originated many years ago. In the Army the retiring age is 64 years and in the Navy 62 years, and it was on the theory of 40 years' service before retiring.

Mr. HICKS. Oh, it started from the end of the race and worked backward?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 54, noes 4.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 2, not voting 107, as follows:

YEAS—261.

Alexander	Emerson	Larsen	Sears
Almon	Esch	Lea, Cal.	Sells
Anderson	Evaus	Lever	Shallenberger
Anthony	Fairchild, B. L.	Linthicum	Sherwood
Ashbrook	Fess	Littlepage	Shouse
Aswell	Fields	Lobeck	Sims
Ayres	Flood	London	Sinnott
Bankhead	Focht	Loneragan	Sisson
Barnhart	Foster	Lufkin	Slayden
Beakes	Francis	Lundeen	Sloan
Beshlin	Frear	Lunn	Smith, Idaho
Black	Freeman	McAndrews	Smith, Mich.
Blackmon	French	McArthur	Smith, C. B.
Bland	Fuller, Ill.	McClinch	Snell
Blanton	Fuller, Mass.	McCulloch	Snook
Booher	Gallivan	McFadden	Snyder
Bowers	Gandy	McKenzie	Stafford
Brand	Garner	McKeown	Steagall
Browne	Garrett, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stedman
Browning	Garrett, Tex.	McLemore	Steenerson
Brumbaugh	Gillett	Magee	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Glynn	Mansfield	Stephens, Nebr.
Butler	Goodwin, Ark.	Mapes	Sterling, Ill.
Byrnes, S. C.	Gordon	Martin	Stevenson
Byrnes, Tenn.	Graham, Ill.	Mays	Stines
Caldwell	Gray, N. J.	Miller, Wash.	Strong
Campbell, Kans.	Green, Iowa	Montague	Sumners
Candler, Miss.	Greene, Mass.	Moon	Switzer
Cannon	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Ind.	Talbott
Caraway	Hadley	Morgan	Taylor, Ark.
Carter, Okla.	Hamilton, Mich.	Neely	Thomas
Cary	Hamlin	Nelson	Tillman
Chandler, Okla.	Hardy	Nicholls, S. C.	Tilson
Claypool	Harrison, Va.	Oldfield	Timberlake
Coady	Hastings	Oliver, N. Y.	Towner
Collier	Haugen	Olney	Van Dyke
Connally, Tex.	Hawley	O'Shaunessy	Venable
Cooper, Ohio	Hayden	Overmyer	Vestal
Cooper, W. Va.	Heflin	Overstreet	Vinson
Cooper, Wis.	Helm	Padgett	Volstead
Copley	Hensley	Park	Walker
Cox	Hersey	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Crago	Hicks	Parker, N. Y.	Walton
Cramton	Hilliard	Peters	Ward
Crisp	Holland	Platt	Wason
Crosser	Houston	Pou	Watkins
Dallinger	Huddleston	Pratt	Watson, Va.
Davidson	Hull, Tenn.	Purnell	Weaver
Decker	Igoe	Quin	Webb
Delaney	Ireland	Rainey, H. T.	Welty
Dempsey	James	Rainey, J. W.	Whaley
Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Raker	Wheeler
Dickinson	Johnson, Wash.	Randall	White, Me.
Dill	Juhl	Rayburn	White, Ohio
Dixon	Kahn	Reed	Williams
Dominick	Keating	Robbins	Wilson, Tex.
Doolittle	Kehoe	Rogers	Wise
Dowell	Kennedy, Iowa	Romjue	Wood, Ind.
Drane	Kettner	Rouse	Woodyard
Dupré	Key, Ohio	Rubey	Wright
Dyer	Kless, Pa.	Russell	Young, N. Dak.
Eagan	Kincheleoe	Sabath	Young, Tex.
Eagle	Kinkaid	Sanders, Ind.	Zihlman
Elliott	Kitchin	Scott, Iowa	
Ellsworth	Knutson	Scott, Mich.	
Elston	Langley	Scully	

NAYS—2.

Graham, Pa. Madden

NOT VOTING—167.

Austin	Denison	Gray, Ala.	La Follette
Bacharach	Denton	Gregg	La Guardia
Baer	Dewalt	Griest	Lazaro
Barkley	Dies	Griffin	Lee, Ga.
Bell	Dillon	Hamilton, N. Y.	Leibach
Borland	Donovan	Harrison, Miss.	Leshner
Britten	Dooling	Haskell	Little
Brodbeck	Doremus	Hayes	Longworth
Burnett	Doughton	Heaton	McCormick
Burroughs	Drukker	Helntz	McKinley
Campbell, Pa.	Dunn	Helvering	McLaughlin, Pa.
Cantrill	Edmonds	Hollingsworth	Maher
Carew	Estopinal	Hood	Maun
Carlin	Fairchild, G. W.	Hull, Iowa	Mason
Carter, Mass.	Fairfield	Humphreys	Meeker
Chandler, N. Y.	Farr	Husted	Merritt
Church	Ferris	Hutchinson	Miller, Minn.
Clark, Fla.	Fisher	Jacoway	Mondell
Clark, Pa.	Flynn	Johnson, S. Dak.	Morin
Classon	Fordney	Jones	Mott
Cleary	Gallagher	Kearns	Mudd
Connelly, Kans.	Gard	Kelley, Mich.	Nichols, Mich.
Costello	Garland	Kelly, Pa.	Nolan
Currie, Mich.	Glass	Kennedy, R. I.	Norton
Curry, Cal.	Good	King	Oliver, Ala.
Dale, N. Y.	Goodall	Kraus	Osborne
Dale, Vt.	Gould	Kreider	Paige
Darrow			Phelan
Davis			

Polk	Rose	Slomp	Tinkham
Porter	Rowe	Small	Treadway
Powers	Rowland	Smith, T. F.	Vare
Price	Rucker	Steele	Voigt
Ragsdale	Sanders, La.	Sterling, Pa.	Waidow
Ramsey	Sanders, N. Y.	Sullivan	Watson, Pa.
Ramseyer	Sanford	Sweet	Welling
Rankin	Saunders, Va.	Swift	Wilson, Ill.
Reavis	Schall	Tagoe	Wilson, La.
Riordan	Scott, Pa.	Taylor, Colo.	Wingo
Roberts	Shackleford	Temple	Winslow
Robinson	Sherley	Templeton	Woods, Iowa
Rodenberg	Siegel	Thompson	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. REAVIS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. BURROUGHS.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. GARLAND.

Mr. SCHALL with Mr. NOLAN.

Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. WALDOW.

Mr. BARNHART with Mr. LEHLBACH.

Mr. BELL with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. SIEGEL.

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. TEMPLE.

Mr. DENTON with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. HELVERING with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.

Mr. FISHER with Mr. DALE of Vermont.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. DILLON.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HAYES.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama with Mr. HEATON.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. POLK with Mr. MASON.

Mr. BAER. Mr. Speaker, the bells did not ring in the House Office Building for this roll call, and so I have come in too late to vote. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's statement will appear in the RECORD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

On a motion of Mr. PADGETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3803. An act authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property, heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States, in connection with, or incidental to, the prosecution of the war.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the committee of conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3803) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell supplies, materials, equipment, or other property, heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States, in connection with, or incidental to, the prosecution of the war.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making an appropriation for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives.

MUNICIPAL WATER SUPPLY FOR SAN DIEGO, CAL.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10587) granting to the city of San Diego certain lands in the Cleveland National Forest and the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation for dam and reservoir purposes for the conservation of water, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH. Let it go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. MADDEN. I object. No; let it go off the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It will not. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3132) to amend section 2171 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to naturalization.

MANNING OF VESSELS SUBJECT TO INSPECTION LAWS.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1545) to amend the act of March 3, 1913, entitled "An act to regulate the officering and manning of vessels subject to the inspection laws of the United States."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas just what this bill proposes to do.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill that came to the House and was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It only does one simple thing. It adds to existing law four words. The officering and manning statute required a certain number of watch officers on board vessels of a thousand tons, a certain number on those of 200 and less than a thousand, and a certain number on those of 100 and less than 200. It included in vessels requiring those watch officers wrecking vessels, and it excepted from its watch-officer requirements certain vessels by the following words:

Provided, That this section shall not apply to fishing or whaling vessels, yachts, or motor boats as defined in the act of June 9, 1910.

Now, what this bill here does is to add to the proviso these words "or to wrecking vessels." It is to cure a manifest oversight. If it had been thought of when the original law was passed, it would have been known that wrecking vessels do not need alternate watches because they are chiefly stationed about some vessel being salvaged.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it too important a bill to be taken up under unanimous consent, and I ask the gentleman if he will not allow it to remain on the calendar.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will permit me to say this, that the department recommended and every interest involved asks for it. It has lain over since the last Unanimous Consent Calendar day. There is to the bill absolutely no objection, and the committee reporting it is unanimous after a full investigation.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I will.

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I am positive if the gentleman from Illinois understood the situation he would not object. Now, if the gentleman will allow me. Heretofore the law compelled all ships of whatever character to carry a certain number of employees for the safety and welfare of the men on ship, as well as the property. It was found that wrecking vessels were laid up alongside of a ship for days, and it was really a great hardship to compel that character of boats to carry extra employees, and that it was entirely unnecessary to have such employees aboard. That is what this bill does, it simply relieves them of that necessity.

Mr. MADDEN. Is this to make an exception of that kind; is that the only object in the law?

Mr. HARDY. Absolutely the only object. It simply adds these words "or to wrecking vessels." I will read it to the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. Regular order!

Mr. MADDEN. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is, Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4463 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and it is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4463. No vessel of the United States subject to the provisions of this title or to the inspection laws of the United States shall be navigated unless she shall have in her service and on board such complement of licensed officers and crew, including certificated lifeboat men, separately stated, as may, in the judgment of the local inspectors who inspect the vessel, be necessary for her safe navigation. The local inspectors shall make in the certificate of inspection of the vessel an entry of such complement of officers and crew, including certificated lifeboat men, separately stated, which may be changed from time to time by indorsement on such certificate by local inspectors by reason of change of conditions or employment. Such entry or indorsement shall be subject to a right of appeal, under regulations to be made by the Secretary of Commerce, to the supervising inspector and from him to the Supervising Inspector General, who shall have the power to revise, set aside, or affirm the said determination of the local inspectors.

"If any such vessel is deprived of the services of any number of the crew, including certificated lifeboat men, separately stated, without the consent, fault, or collusion of the master, owner, or any person interested in the vessel, the vessel may proceed on her voyage if, in the judgment of the master, she is sufficiently manned for such voyage: *Provided, That the master shall ship, if obtainable, a number equal to the number of those whose services he has been deprived of by desertion or casualty, who must be of the same grade or of a higher rating with those whose places they fill. If the master shall fail to explain, in writing, the cause of such deficiency in the crew, including certificated lifeboat men, separately stated, to the local inspectors within 12 hours of the time of the arrival of the vessel at her destination, he shall be liable to a penalty of \$50. If the vessel shall not be manned as provided in this act, the owner shall be liable to a penalty of \$100, or in case of an insufficient number of licensed officers to a penalty of \$500."*

Sec. 2. That the board of local inspectors shall make an entry in the certificate of inspection of every ocean and coastwise seagoing merchant vessel of the United States propelled by machinery, and every ocean-going vessel carrying passengers, the minimum number of licensed deck officers required for her safe navigation according to the following scale:

That no such vessel shall be navigated unless she shall have on board and in her service one duly licensed master.

That every such vessel of 1,000 gross tons and over, propelled by machinery, shall have in her service and on board three licensed mates, who shall stand in three watches while such vessel is being navigated, unless such vessel is engaged in a run of less than 400 miles from the port of departure to the port of final destination, then such vessel shall have two licensed mates; and every vessel of 200 gross tons and less than 1,000 gross tons, propelled by machinery, shall have two licensed mates.

That every such vessel of 100 gross tons and under 200 gross tons, propelled by machinery, shall have on board and in her service one licensed mate, but if such vessel is engaged in a trade in which the time required to make the passage from the port of departure to the port of destination exceeds 24 hours, then such vessel shall have two licensed mates.

That nothing in this section shall be so construed as to prevent local inspectors from increasing the number of licensed officers on any vessel subject to the inspection laws of the United States, if, in their judgment, such vessel is not sufficiently manned for her safe navigation: *Provided, That this section shall not apply to fishing or whaling vessels, yachts, or motor boats as defined in the act of June 9, 1910, or to wrecking vessels.*

Sec. 3. That it shall be unlawful for the master, owner, agent, or other person having authority to permit an officer of any vessel to take charge of the deck watch of the vessel upon leaving or immediately after leaving port, unless such officer shall have had at least 6 hours off duty within the 12 hours immediately preceding the time of sailing, and no licensed officer on any ocean or coastwise vessel shall be required to do duty to exceed 9 hours of any 24 while in port, including the date of arrival, or more than 12 hours of any 24 at sea, except in a case of emergency when life or property is endangered. Any violation of this section shall subject the person or persons guilty thereof to a penalty of \$100.

Sec. 4. That all laws or parts of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARDY. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Did I understand the gentleman from Texas to say that this exception only applies to wrecking vessels when they were laid alongside of crafts?

Mr. HARDY. The idea is that it does not apply to wrecking vessels at all. They are not involved in carrying passengers, and it was a hardship upon them, being mainly engaged in still work to require them, if they happened to be a large vessel, to have three watches. The parties in interest, every shipbuilding interest, consulted about it say that it is unnecessary to have these employees on these vessels.

Mr. WALSH. One further question. Is there a section of law in which the term "wrecking vessels" is defined so as to apply only to a certain kind of craft? Of course, very many times ordinary towboats, tugboats, go on wrecking expeditions, and I wondered if it applied to steam lighters or just vessels which are engaged exclusively in wrecking work.

Mr. HARDY. My idea is that the term "wrecking vessel" has a definite and popular meaning.

Mr. WALSH. I thought that might be the case.

Mr. HARDY. I do not think it is defined by law. I am sure it is not; but I do not think any vessel would be exempted from having the officers required by present law, through the passage of this bill, except a vessel that was being used as a wrecking vessel.

Mr. ROBBINS. Is this bill intended to apply to boats that run on the rivers of the interior of the country not connected with salt water?

Mr. HARDY. The original act, if the gentleman will permit, was passed in 1913. Section 2 of that act deals wholly with ocean-going or seagoing vessels. It is not an inland measure. The bill we are asking to pass copies existing law and adds to it the four words I have mentioned.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is on page 4, line 12?

Mr. HARDY. On page 4, line 12.

Mr. ROBBINS. The four words "or to wrecking vessels"?

Mr. HARDY. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Then it does not apply to inland streams, like the Ohio and the Monongahela Rivers?

Mr. HARDY. If you will look at the existing law, it says:

That the board of local inspectors shall make an entry in the certificate of inspection of every ocean and coastwise seagoing merchant vessel of the United States—

And so forth. And the law continues, stating how many officers they are required to have. Then there is a proviso exempting certain kinds of vessels from its requirements:

Provided, That this section shall not apply to fishing or whaling vessels, yachts, or motor boats.

We simply add "or to wrecking vessels" to the proviso.

Mr. ROBBINS. I do not believe it applies to inland streams.

Mr. HARDY. No. The original act did not apply to anything except ocean-going vessels. And this exempts wrecking vessels from the provisions of the act.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does it not apply to the Great Lakes?

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman will bear in mind that this bill is not enacting any new legislation. This was the original officering and manning act, which applies to the ocean-going vessels. I do not think the original act, or section 2 of it, applied to anything but ocean-going vessels. Part of the original act applies to all vessels of the United States. It is section 4463 of the Revised Statutes, but section 2 of section 4463 applies only to seagoing vessels and it is the proviso to this section 2 which we are amending. The whole thing is to relieve wrecking vessels from being required to keep a useless and burdensome number of officers or employees.

When this bill was before the Senate, it was referred to the Department of Commerce, and was approved by this letter from the Secretary to Senator FLETCHER:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 18, 1917.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am in receipt of yours of the 14th instant, inclosing S. 1545, "To amend the act of March 3, 1913, entitled 'An act to regulate the officering and manning of vessels subject to the inspection laws of the United States.'"

Section 4463, of which the proposed bill is an amendment, provides the number of licensed mates vessels are required to carry under certain conditions. Excepted from the provisions are fishing or whaling vessels, yachts, and motor boats. The proposed bill adds to this list of exceptions wrecking vessels, as no good reason is perceived why they should be included within the provisions of the section. This bill has the approval of the department and I recommend that it be enacted into law.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD,
Secretary.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HARDY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

READMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIENS.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House joint resolution 255.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or belligerent forces.

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration act of February 5, 1917, excluding from the United States aliens who are likely to become a public charge, or who are physically defective, or who are contract laborers, or who have come in consequence of advertisements for labor printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country, or who are assisted by others to come, or whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, or who are stowaways, or who are illiterate, aliens lawfully resident in the United States when heretofore or hereafter enlisted or conscripted for the military service of the United States; and aliens lawfully resident in the United States who, prior to April 6, 1917, declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, and

who have enlisted for service with Czecho-Slovak, Polish, or other independent forces attached to the United States Army or to the army of any one of the belligerents of the United States in the present war, who may, within one year after the termination of the war, apply for readmission to this country, after being honorably discharged or granted furlough abroad by the proper military authorities, or after being rejected on final examination in connection with their enlistment or conscription, shall be readmitted; and that any alien of either of the two foregoing descriptions who would otherwise be excluded under said section of the Immigration act on the ground that he is idiotic, imbecile, feeble-minded, epileptic, insane, or has had one or more attacks of insanity, or on the ground that he is afflicted with constitutional psychopathic inferiority, tuberculosis, a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, or mental defect, shall be readmitted if it is proved that the disability was acquired while the alien was serving in the military forces of the United States or in an independent force of the kind heretofore described, if such alien returns to a port of the United States within one year after the termination of the war; and that the head tax provided in the Immigration act of February 5, 1917, shall not be collected from aliens readmitted into the United States under the provisions of this resolution: *Provided*, That if any alien readmitted to the United States in pursuance of the terms hereof shall at any time thereafter become a public charge the expense of maintenance and care shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has 20 minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution measures up to the much-abused standard of a "war measure." It is a resolution that has been urged on the attention of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization—and it is an immigration measure, by the way—by the Department of State and by the Secretary of Labor through the Commissioner of Immigration. I have here, and I shall print it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, with the consent of the House, a letter from the Solicitor of the State Department, Mr. Polk, who complains that the bill does not go quite far enough. Originally it was the idea, I believe, of my friend, the chairman, as it was the desire of the Department of State, that these lawfully resident aliens who had gone from this country and engaged in war against our enemies in Europe should be permitted to return, whether they had declared their intention to become citizens or not. Now, we have not gone quite that far. Our bill merely proposes to grant men who were aliens and who have enlisted, or may be hereafter enlisted, or have been conscripted or may be hereafter conscripted into our service, permission to come back into the United States without regard to the ordinary immigration restrictions, basing this right upon the fact that they were here lawfully before and that they have joined us by going to Europe to help fight our enemies.

It also proposes that aliens lawfully resident in the United States prior to the declaration of war and who had declared their intention to become citizens, who have joined the Czecho-Slovak, Polish, or other independent forces cooperating with us in the war against Germany or Austria-Hungary, to come back to the United States without regard to the usual immigration restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is reported to the House with a unanimous recommendation that it be agreed to as a simple act of justice to certain persons who were lawfully residing in the United States prior to the declaration of war against the central powers on April 6, 1917.

It is quite the custom now to support every proposed act, from the local and trivial to the most important, with the statement that it is a war measure. For that reason I hesitate to use a phrase so much abused, although this is in fact a real war measure. It is evident on its face that it is. The Department of State, in letters to Chairman BURNETT, of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and to me, ask its passage as such. Letters approving it have also come from the Department of Labor and the subordinate Bureau of Naturalization.

The committee did not accept it because administrative officers indorsed the central thought of the bill. They did not, in fact, accept it as those officials wanted it. It is not as liberal as some of them would like to have it. The aim of the committee has been to do justice to the classes whom it seeks to relieve from certain embarrassments and hardships that grow out of the war and to restrict its concessions in such a way that it will be acceptable to the Congress. I believe that we have succeeded in doing so.

When the war began there were a number of aliens lawfully residing in the United States who were not citizens, who are not citizens now, although many of them had declared their in-

tention to become citizens. Among these resident aliens were many immigrants from Polish territory under the control of Germany, Austria, and Russia, as well as the Czechs, or Bohemians. They are virile, aggressive, aspiring representatives of the great Slavic family, and instinctively and racially hostile to the Governments of Germany and Austria-Hungary. Only a negligible number of these people are loyally attached to the countries to which they owe a nominal allegiance. In the countries of their birth and in the lands of adoption they nurse hostility to their traditional enemies—the Germans and Austrians—and are eager to fight them when there is the faintest hope of success.

Some of them had declared their intention to become citizens before the 6th of April, 1917, and some had neglected to do so, although all probably meant to do so ultimately.

When the call to arms came in 1914 many Poles, Czechs, and other Slavs went to Europe and joined the forces of Serbia, Britain, France, and Russia to fight the Governments they had been taught to regard as the oppressors of their people. It seemed to be a way to correct the injustice done to Poland when her sovereignty was killed and her territory divided in 1795, and to settle old scores with ancient enemies. Bohemians believed that the time had come when their national aspirations might be gratified.

For all that we only owed them sympathy and admiration. Americans have always admired and sympathized with struggling people who aspire to independence. But that was the affair of their kinsmen across the sea and of themselves, so far as they cared to make it so. However, for those who have gone or may go into our Army since their enemies have become ours the situation is altogether different.

Important armies have been formed out of these brave and patriotic people who voluntarily abandoned comfort and security in the United States and in other countries to go back to Europe and fight against governments who are our enemies as well as theirs. France has given official recognition to one such army. By a decree of the French Republic, dated December 16, 1917, the Czecho-Slovak Army, which, I am told, has more than a hundred thousand men in it, is made a part of the military forces under French command, although autonomous and fighting under its own flag.

Remember these people have thrown off forever all allegiance to the Government of the countries of their birth. They need adoption by some country in the struggle for democracy. Otherwise their hazard is double. They may be killed in battle and if captured they are certain to be shot as traitors. It is our duty, as it is our interest, to give those who were in this country all the protection the law can afford. Even in this resolution we do not go as far as we should. Although we fall short of our full duty what we propose here should be done, and done as quickly as possible.

Among those who will benefit by this resolution, if it shall become law, there are, in addition to Czecho-Slovaks, large numbers of Jews, Armenians, and Syrians who were residing in the United States a year ago, who are now in Europe or Asia fighting for liberty and democracy.

This resolution provides that aliens who were here before we declared war on the central powers and who have heretofore been conscripted for service with the Army of the United States, or who have volunteered, or who may hereafter go into it voluntarily or by draft, may be readmitted to the United States if they apply for readmission within one year after the close of the war. This class of aliens will be permitted to return notwithstanding the fact that they have not declared their purpose to become citizens.

The resolution also authorizes the return to the United States, within one year after the termination of the war, of aliens who were residing here prior to April 6, 1917, who had declared their intention to become citizens and who have enlisted for military service with any one of the cobelligerents of the United States in the present war, or with Czecho-Slovak, Polish, or other independent forces attached to the United States Army, or to that of any one of the cobelligerents of the United States, after being honorably discharged or furloughed abroad by proper military authority.

In a word, the resolution only proposes to give these aliens the status and rights they had as lawful residents of the United States prior to April 6, 1917, but in recognition of their service in a cause in which Americans are sacrificing blood and treasure it proposes to waive the immigrant head tax that would otherwise be collected when they return.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization was unanimous in its vote directing that this resolution be favorably reported. It does not go quite as far in the way of relief as the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SABATH, the author of a similar measure, or the Department of Labor thought desirable, but it

will do an act of justice to people whose services are valuable and who by associating themselves with us, or with the allied powers in Europe, incur unusual peril.

Here is what the Department of Labor has to say about this resolution:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, February 28, 1918.

HON. JAMES L. SLAYDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SLAYDEN: The commissioner general has advised me that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House, at its meeting of this morning, directed you to report favorably the joint resolution introduced by you on February 19 "authorizing the readmission to the United States of certain aliens who have been conscripted or have volunteered for service with the military forces of the United States or cobelligerent forces."

While this resolution does not go as far as this department had hoped Congress might be disposed to go in granting exemption to alien residents of the United States who enter the Army of this country or the army of one of the countries associated with the United States in the conduct of the war, it will aid materially in the handling of cases that will surely confront the Immigration Service during the continuance of the war and for some months after its close. I wish, therefore, to express to you the hope of the department that the resolution may be adopted by the House at a very early date.

Respectfully, yours,

LOUIS F. POST,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, no American should forget that to some of these people we owe a peculiar debt of gratitude. In our days of trial, when we were few and weak, when we were struggling to establish our independence, two gallant Poles came to America and associated themselves with George Washington. They became an indelible and glorious part of the history of the United States.

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, with a letter from Benjamin Franklin, joined Washington, and our great chief made him a staff officer at once, and in recognition of his worth and high talents assigned to him important duty as an engineer. He remained to the end, and Congress, in 1783, made him a brigadier general "for long, faithful, and honorable service in the American Army."

Pulaski, who began fighting for liberty as a youth and continued it to his heroic death, was a firm believer in the doctrine of "self-determination," or, as we phrase the same thought, the right to government by the consent of the governed. He also came to our country with letters from the great and learned Dr. Benjamin Franklin and joined the American Army in 1777. He distinguished himself at Brandywine, defended Charleston in 1779, and was killed at Savannah in the same year, greatly admired and beloved by his commander in chief, Washington.

Remembering these things, can we refuse to grant this act of justice to his countrymen of to-day, who are fighting shoulder to shoulder with Americans?

THE SOLICITOR FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 8, 1918.

HON. JAMES L. SLAYDEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SLAYDEN: I notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that House joint resolution 255 has recently been called up in the House, and I desire to call to your attention one point which occurs to me in respect to it.

Our cobelligerents have informally interested themselves in the question of return to this country of their citizens or subjects who leave the United States to serve in their armies and by reason of some incapacity received in such service are prohibited from returning to the United States under the present immigration laws, even though they have lived for many years in the United States and have established their families, residences, and businesses here. Our cobelligerents have been anxious, therefore, to have some leniency shown in respect to the return of such persons into the United States after the completion of service abroad.

As I read House joint resolution 255, it applies to aliens who enter the military service of the United States, or aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, but does not cover the class of aliens who have not declared their intention to become citizens of the United States and have gone abroad to enter the military service of their own country or one of the cobelligerents. I presume there are not many aliens of this class, but would it not be possible to show consideration to our cobelligerents in this small matter by making House joint resolution 255 applicable to citizens or subjects of our cobelligerents who have gone or shall go abroad to serve their own country or one of the allies in the same cause in which we are so earnestly and deeply engaged?

House joint resolution 212, introduced in the House by Mr. BURNETT January 10, 1918, had the approval of the State Department as well as the Department of Labor and appeared to be broad enough to cover the class of aliens which I have mentioned.

Yours, sincerely,

FRANK L. POLK.

MR. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the vital objection to this bill is not the authorization feature granting to those aliens who have declared their intention to become citizens and who have joined independent organizations to fight in behalf of the allies in foreign fields the right, notwithstanding physical defects that they may have acquired or other objections that would be sufficient to exclude them under the existing naturalization law, to be readmitted to this country, but that provision contained in the proviso of this resolution which levies upon the National Government the support of all these aliens regardless

of whether their injuries have been the result of war or not, whether abroad or whether in this country. I direct the attention of the Members of the House to the wording of that proviso, and I wish to advise the House that that was no part of the original resolution when it was presented to the attention of the Department of Labor and the Department of State, but was incorporated in the committee. The language is as follows:

Provided, That if any alien readmitted to the United States in pursuance of the terms hereof shall at any time thereafter become a public charge the expense of maintenance and care shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

There is no objection to this resolution without that proviso. We are placing in an unfortunate position those who wish to safeguard the Treasury, especially in these times when we need every dollar, but wish to oppose this resolution because of this proviso, which seeks to establish for all time the policy that, regardless of how these aliens become pauperized, regardless of the way in which they may have acquired the injury from which they are suffering, are to become a public charge at the expense of the National Treasury.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] has well known the opposition of some members of the Committee on Appropriations to this bill solely because of that proviso, namely, because it was establishing this precedent, never before recognized by the National Government. This bill could have been passed a month ago under unanimous consent if that proviso had been eliminated. Instead of the respective localities taking care of the burdens of these persons who may become public charges, by this proviso, it is intended to levy that exclusively upon the National Government.

And I call your attention to the fact that that is regardless of the question as to whether the injuries have been received in war or not. They are not part of the National Army. They are fighting our cause, it is true, in connection with the allies, but they may come back here strong and able-bodied, and later they may suffer some accident in connection with industrial employment, or they may become addicted to some vices that may make them paupers, and under such circumstances the burden of maintaining them under our laws has always been on the State and local community. Now you intend, regardless of the character of the injury they receive, to throw that burden on the National Government.

No opportunity is given, if you pass this bill under the suspension of the rules, to amend it and strike out that proviso. If this bill had been brought up in the regular course, a motion to strike out that proviso would have been in order, and this House, by a large majority, might have voted that proviso out, and the main proposal to allow those people to be admitted would have been adopted. But as it is, those who are seeking to protect the Treasury are obliged now to vote against this resolution, because we have no opportunity whatever to amend it by striking out the obnoxious proviso.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. We have provided in the law for certain allowances to be made to soldiers who may be injured, and we expect to provide for further allowances. As I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin, this legislation will create a privileged class, and we will not only allow to them what is allowed in the general law for the benefit of soldiers, but we will absolutely take care of them throughout their natural lives?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not believe the war-insurance act would extend to one class of soldiers who are provided for under this resolution—these persons who are declarants for citizenship and who have joined these Polish and Czech and Slovak organizations, filled with the ambition to do what they can for the support of their different, separate countries abroad. I do not think they would come within the purview of the war-insurance act, because they are not members of the National Army. They are separate and distinct organizations, identified as separate units with the allied forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman will note that on lines 3, 4, and 5 of page 2, lawfully resident aliens who have been enlisted or conscripted can come back here, however, without being taken care of under the soldier's allowance.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is correct in that particular. For the one reason that this resolution adopts a policy for caring for these declarants who have enlisted for foreign service when they shall have become paupers, whatever may have been the cause of their injury, at the expense of the National Government. I think this motion to suspend the rules should be defeated.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I wanted to say to the gentleman that I do not think he is quite accurate in stating what he did in reference to the soldiers being cared for by the United States. We have I do not know how many places where we send these unfortunates. We send them to St. Elizabeths, across the river—civilians, soldiers, unfortunates, lunatics, who are taken care of by the Federal Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Such instances are incident to the government of the District of Columbia, but it has never been the policy, as the gentleman will admit, for the National Government to take care of foreigners coming to this country, suffering from injuries that are not related at all to the national service, as this bill proposes.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. But there is not any precedent for this situation, is there?

Mr. STAFFORD. No. That is why I am opposing this proviso. I wish to say to the Members of the House that we can not to-day forecast the burdens that will be thrown upon our Government by this war, and we should not at this moment establish a policy which will come to plague us in the future. This bill should be rejected under suspension of the rules, and then, if the gentleman wishes, under unanimous consent he can offer the bill without this proviso in it, and in that case I do not think there will be one objection. Under those circumstances those who would vote against this resolution under a suspension of the rules would not have their purposes misconstrued, because their purposes will be plain, of voting against this policy that has never been followed heretofore.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If this proviso is adopted, attempting to take care of these aliens who come back here injured or disabled from any cause, it will put a premium upon men who are slightly disabled undertaking to come back to this country and make themselves permanent public charges.

Mr. STAFFORD. There may be many abuses. One class of them would belong to the class indicated by the suggestion of the gentleman from Washington.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have no further objection to offer beyond that so ably stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]—the objection to undertaking to provide now, far in advance, for the care of men who may return to the United States who are in most cases only first-paper citizens, and in some cases not even first-paper citizens. I hope the gentleman in charge of this resolution will be willing to strike out that proviso from the resolution.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Certainly if through misfortune some of these aliens after their return are so unfortunate as to become public charges somebody ought to bear the expense of their maintenance, inasmuch as they have gone over there to fight side by side with our own troops.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is agreed that they must be cared for, and in plenty of time proper plans will undoubtedly be made.

Mr. WALSH. Who does the gentleman think should be the proper authority to bear the expense?

Mr. MADDEN. I think, Mr. Speaker, in view of the provision in the last part of this resolution, which places the support of these people who are not able to take care of themselves on the Treasury of the United States, we ought to have a quorum present. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves a call of the House. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. A call of the House is ordered. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aswell	Byrnes, S. C.	Chandler, N. Y.	Connelly, Kans.
Bacharach	Campbell, Pa.	Clark, Fla.	Cooper, Ohio
Borland	Cantrill	Clark, Pa.	Copley
Brodbeck	Carew	Classon	Costello
Brumbaugh	Carlin	Cleary	Currie, Mich.
Burroughs	Carter, Mass.	Collier	Curry, Cal.

Dale, N. Y.	Hamilton, N. Y.	McKinley	Sanders, Ia.
Dale, Vt.	Hamlin	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, N. Y.
Darrow	Harrison, Miss.	Maher	Sanford
Davidson	Haskell	Mann	Saunders, Va.
Davis	Haugen	Mason	Schall
Denison	Hawley	Meeker	Scott, Pa.
Dent	Heaton	Merritt	Sells
Dewalt	Heintz	Miller, Minn.	Shackelford
Dies	Hollingsworth	Mondell	Sherley
Dillon	Hood	Montague	Shouse
Donovan	Howard	Moore, Pa.	Siegel
Dooling	Hull, Iowa	Morin	Sims
Drukker	Hull, Tenn.	Mott	Siemp
Dunn	Humphreys	Mudd	Small
Edmonds	Husted	Nelson	Smith, T. F.
Estopinal	Hutchinson	Nolan	Snyder
Fairchild, G. W.	Jacoway	Olney	Steele
Fairfield	James	Padgett	Sullivan
Farr	Johnson, S. Dak.	Paige	Sweet
Ferris	Jones	Peters	Swift
Flynn	Kahn	Polk	Tague
Focht	Kearns	Porter	Talbot
Fordney	Kelley, Mich.	Pou	Temple
Foss	Kelly, Pa.	Powers	Templeton
Frear	Kennedy, R. I.	Pratt	Thompson
Freeman	King	Ragsdale	Tinkham
Gallagher	Knutson	Ramsey	Treadway
Gard	Kreider	Ramseyer	Van Dyke
Garland	LaGuardia	Rankin	Vare
Glass	Lazaro	Reavis	Waldow
Good	Lee, Ga.	Riordan	Watson, Pa.
Goodall	Lehbach	Roberts	Welling
Gould	Leshner	Robinson	Wilson, Ill.
Gray, Ala.	Lever	Rodenberg	Wilson, La.
Greene, Vt.	Little	Rose	Wingo
Gregg	Longworth	Rowe	Winslow
Griest	McArthur	Rowland	Woodyard
Griffin	McCormick	Rucker	
Hamill	McKenzie	Sanders, Ind.	

During the roll call Mr. Landon took the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. On this call 252 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have four minutes remaining. I was undertaking when the point of no quorum was made to restate the objections to the provision found on page 3, lines 9 to 13, which is the only part of this bill subject to much objection. The purpose of the bill is to permit first-paper aliens who have gone to war as part of our armies, and certain other aliens, namely the Czecho-Slovaks, to come back to the United States in case they become insane, break down, lose their legs, or are otherwise injured in the service. But there is attached to this bill, you will notice, a provision—

that if any alien readmitted to the United States in pursuance of the terms hereof shall at any time thereafter become a public charge, the expense of maintenance and care shall be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

I understand that there is no serious objection to that proviso going out of the bill, and at some point during this debate, which is, of course, limited, I shall ask unanimous consent to strike that provision from the bill. I hope consent will be granted; because if these men return, and it is then discovered that they must be cared for, and if it is found that they should be cared for by the United States, then will be the time for Congress to make provision for them, including the hospitals, and provision as to the disposition of the allotments and allowances of the pay of those soldiers who have become crippled or insane, and are not citizens of the United States. By this provision we are taking several steps too far ahead, and might provide legislation that would be an incentive for first-paper aliens now in armies to remain as such rather than complete their naturalization as provided in a bill which this House passed only three days ago.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. COX. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the language at the bottom of page 2. I should like to get the gentleman's version of it and should also like to hear some one in favor of this bill discuss that. I refer to the provision—

and that any alien of either of the two foregoing descriptions who would otherwise be excluded under said section of the immigration act on the ground that he is idiotic, imbecile, feeble-minded, epileptic, insane, or has had one or more attacks of insanity, or on the ground that he is afflicted with constitutional psychopathic inferiority, tuberculosis, a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, or mental defect, shall be readmitted if it is proved that the disability was acquired while the alien was serving in the military forces of the United States or in an independent force of the kind hereinbefore described, if such alien returns to a port of the United States within one year after the termination of the war.

My inquiry is this: What does the gentleman think about the propriety or impropriety of admitting men who are idiotic, imbecile, feeble-minded, and whether or not such a state of mind can come to a man while he is in the Army? I always understood that those were diseases attaching at birth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I agree with the gentleman, by and large, but these words follow the phraseology of section 3 of the immigration law, which names classes of aliens to whom admission to the United States is denied. We follow the wording, leaving out only the words "chronic alcoholism," because we thought alien soldiers could hardly acquire that in the line of service, and if they did they should be barred from returning to the United States. But time for debate is limited, and what I want to discuss is the provision that the United States is to pay for all time the care of these afflicted persons. The clause should come out of the bill.

Mr. COX. I am with the gentleman. I think the bill ought to be defeated with that in it.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FESS. In the hearings on the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers cases were cited where persons suffered from shell shock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; that is a fearful thing, but I do not want to get into a discussion of that. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of an amendment to strike out the words beginning on line 9, page 3, which amendment I offer.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the gentleman ask that at the end of the debate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I withdraw it for the present.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is apparent. Under the present immigration law if an alien formerly residing here joins our Army or joins the Czecho-Slovak forces that are fighting against the central powers, should be shot to pieces and become disabled, and should be granted a discharge while in those countries and afterwards seeks readmission here, no matter how gallant and courageous he may have been, he would be excluded. That is the purpose of the bill. The objection seems to settle around the proviso. I want to state, gentlemen, that the proviso is no pet of mine or of the gentleman who introduced and reported this bill [Mr. SLAYDEN]. It would be perfectly agreeable and satisfactory, so far as I am concerned, to strike it out.

But gentlemen from States where these people will concentrate when they return felt that it would be an injustice to those States to be compelled to support these men who had fought in our Army—and you notice that those who fight with the Czecho-Slovaks have to be declarants, while those who join our Army do not have to be declarants if they should become public charges. Those who join the Czecho-Slovaks and fight the central powers must have been residents in this country, and also they must have taken out first papers before they can be admitted under this bill. There is a distinction there. The first part of it applies to the conditions of illiteracy, and so forth, and the second embraces those who have become idiotic, imbecile, feeble-minded, epileptic, and insane, and so forth, provided that the disability was acquired while the alien was serving in the military forces of the United States or in the independent forces referred to in the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information? In regard to this disability of constitutional psychopathic inferiority, that could not be contracted in the line of duty in the service. I do not know what it is. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNETT. How does the gentleman know it could not be contracted in the service if he does not know what it is? I want to say that is in the immigration bill, and was put in this bill at the suggestion of the Bureau of Immigration and Department of Labor. This is a Department of Labor bill, as stated by my colleague on the committee [Mr. SLAYDEN], and the State Department indorses it and says it is very anxious for the passage of the bill, because the Secretary of State feels that it is only a matter of justice to these people. I do not care about that question of idiocy, and I do not care about the question of constitutional psychopathic inferiority.

Mr. SLAYDEN. They are features of the law from which we are exempting these people.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; and if no idiocy and constitutional psychopathic inferiority is incurred, we can not hurt anybody by including them, and therefore they are innocuous.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will pardon me, I understand he has no objection to striking out this proviso at the end of the bill?

Mr. BURNETT. I have not, but I want to tell the House why it was put in there. Some members of the committee from States where most of these people would land or would come after landing felt that it would be unjust to them to have to take care of these people if they afterwards became public charges. That is why it was put in. It struck me with a good deal of force that if aliens who had gone into the Army and made gallant soldiers and incurred disabilities there and were readmitted should become charges in the States of New York or New Jersey or Massachusetts, or any other State, that the Government itself, for which they had been fighting, ought to pay the expenses of their care, and not the States to which they happen to go or in which they happen to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We passed a bill here the other day, and I thought a very important one, to permit first-paper aliens to finish up their citizenship as they go into the Army.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He does not have to do that, and this would put a premium upon his staying a first-paper alien and have the future possibility of care forever by the United States.

Mr. BURNETT. So far as I am concerned, I am not going to object to striking it out. It is not my baby, but I felt it was perhaps a matter of justice to States where they would congregate. My colleague on the committee, Mr. SMITH of New York, has an amendment which I believe will meet all of the objections and make it perfectly fair, and that is to insert after the words "public charge" the words "by reason of disability incurred in service and in line of duty"; and I can not see, if they incurred these disabilities in the service and in line of duty, how there can be any objection. He will ask unanimous consent to have that inserted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, one year and one month ago to-day when the Congress of these United States declared war against the Imperial Government of Germany hundreds of thousands of Bohemians, Poles, and Slovaks in this country, anxious to show their appreciation of the blessings of freedom and liberty which they had enjoyed under the protection of our great Republic and eager to bestow upon all oppressed nations the blessings of liberty and democracy and to maintain it against the unscrupulous foe that threatens it, organized groups, companies, regiments, and, where the number permitted, whole divisions. Assisted by the Czecho-Slovak, Jugo-Slovak, and Polish organizations they crossed the ocean, joining the allied forces in all the different countries; some in France, some in Great Britain, and some in Italy, so that they could, without delay, immediately engage in the battle for liberty and democracy. [Applause.] They are there to-day, struggling, fighting, sacrificing their lives for our country and for our cause. [Great applause.]

A great majority of these men were still technically subjects of Austria-Hungary, and, in addition to all the hazards and dangers of war, fully realized that if captured they would not be treated as prisoners of war but would be considered traitors to Austria-Hungary and, as such, immediately executed. Notwithstanding this added danger during these 13 months these former residents of these United States have demonstrated to the allies and to the whole world their fearlessness, their determination, their devotion, and their loyalty to the cause to which we have consecrated our all. Reenforced by the thousands of their kinsmen who were able to escape from the Austro-Hungarian armies, they are to-day fighting under their Czecho-Slovak, Jugo-Slovak, and Polish flags, side by side with the gallant French, with the heroic British, and the loyal Italian armies, and, as long as it was possible, fought to death with the tottering Russian armies. Thousands upon thousands of these former residents of our country, fighting under their own banners, have not called for or received any aid or assistance from our Government.

Within the last three months whenever we heard from these men we at all times found them fighting to the bitter end with their slogan, "It is better to die for liberty a soldier than to be executed as a traitor." [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, I am proud of their deeds and of their heroism, and when the history of this great war for freedom of the seas, rights of people, independence of all nations and nationalities and civilization is written the names of these brave men, who are sacrificing their

lives, will form a large roll of honor. [Applause.] Would to God that they could all come back, but that we know is impossible. Some will have to make the supreme sacrifice, but we do know that some will come back to receive the plaudits and thanks of a Nation who will turn out to receive the saviors of liberty and democracy—true it is, some will come in full possession of their health, others will return minus limbs, minus hearing, or minus vision, but return they will, and when they do we, for whose liberty and safety they fought and bled and suffered, shall by this legislation—the least appreciation we can show—give them the privilege to come back to the country which they left for the purpose of defending its rights, its honor, its safety, and its heritage. [Applause.] With open arms should we receive them, with throbbing hearts and fast-beating pulsations as our eyes fill with happiness at the return of these brave men, and not a single obstruction nor a single restriction shall we place in their way.

Mr. Speaker, I know that our own boys will demonstrate, and have already demonstrated, their courage and their worth; but permit me, if you please, to make this distinction: They are fighting for a country of which they are citizens and a country which is leaving nothing undone to provide for their comfort and for the comfort of those they leave behind; but the men that this resolution is to assist are not our citizens, even though many have declared their intention to become such, and have not received, and as yet are not entitled to receive, the protection of our country and the provisions it makes for the comfort of its own citizens. Our soldiers receive a fair and reasonable compensation and are taken care of by way of our war-risk insurance law and other similar legislation; but those for whom I am pleading to-day receive no compensation whatsoever except the compensation of fighting and dying for a great and noble cause. For them there is no provision made for their dependents nor for pensions, and all that is asked to-day is that when, through their efforts combined with our gallant allies, this war shall have come to a victorious end for the allied forces and the cause of liberty, humanity, democracy, and civilization has triumphed—that when this time comes all these men, those who remain and desire to come back, if maimed or blind or deaf, shall be received and shall not be penalized because in defense of those principles perhaps the sacrifice they made disqualifies them from passing the physical or educational test. [Applause.]

The technical points raised against the resolution are so frivolous they are not entitled to any consideration. As to the last provision in the resolution, I care not whether it is stricken out or not, because I feel satisfied that very few of those who come back will ever become a charge upon our Government, and I know and pledge you my word that very few who are fighting in the Czecho-Slovak or Polish armies will ever become public charges. I know that they will be taken care of by the American-Czecho-Slovak, the American-Polish, and the American-Jugo-Slovak Alliance, who were instrumental in aiding them to have the distinction and honor to fight against the Hohenzollern and Hapsburg tyrannies. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have only feebly expressed my sentiments in this matter and I have only partially explained the provisions of this resolution. I hoped that my first resolution, introduced on February 6, 1918, would receive the favorable consideration of the committee. In this I have been disappointed, but nevertheless I am heartily in favor of the modified resolution and thankful for it. My joint resolution reads as follows:

[Feb. 6, 1918. Mr. SABATH introduced the following joint resolution: which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.]

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the immigration act of February 5, 1917, excluding from the United States aliens who are likely to become a public charge, or who are physically defective, or who are contract laborers, or who have come in consequence of advertisements for labor, printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country, or who are assisted by others to come, or whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another or by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign government, or who are stowaways, or who are illiterate, aliens lawfully resident within the United States at the time of enlistment or conscription who have enlisted or been conscripted, or hereafter shall be enlisted or conscripted, for the military service of the United States or any one of the belligerents of the United States in the present war, or who have enlisted and joined the Czecho-Slovak or Polish Army waging war against any of the central powers, who may, within two years after the termination of the war, apply for readmission to this country, after being honorably discharged or granted furlough abroad in connection with their enlistment or conscription, shall be readmitted; and any such lawfully resident aliens of the United States who would otherwise be excluded under said section of the immigration act on the ground that they are idiotic, imbecile, feeble-minded, epileptic, insane, or have had one or more attacks of insanity, or on ground that they are afflicted with constitutionally psychopathic inferiority, chronic alcoholism, tuberculosis, a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, or a mental defect, shall be readmitted if it is proved that the disability was acquired while the alien was serving in the military forces of the United States or of any one of the nations

co-belligerents of the United States, or who have enlisted and joined the Czecho-Slovak and Polish Army waging war against any one of the central powers in the present war, and if such aliens return to a part of the United States within one year after the termination of the war; and the head tax assessed by section 2 of the said immigration act shall not be collected, or, if collected, shall be refunded in the cases of aliens readmitted to the United States in pursuance of the terms hereof; nor shall the absence abroad of aliens readmitted in pursuance of the provisions hereof be construed to interrupt the continuity of their residence in the United States within the meaning of section 4 of the naturalization act approved June 29, 1906, if the commanding officer of the military organization or branch thereof in which such alien has rendered military service certifies, in support of his petition for naturalization, that he has personal knowledge that such alien is a person of good moral character and is in every way qualified, in such officer's opinion, to be admitted as a citizen of the United States, and if any alien readmitted to the United States in pursuance of the terms hereof shall at any time thereafter become a public charge, the expense of his maintenance and care in the public institution to which he may be committed shall be paid from the appropriation for the enforcement of the immigration act.

Permit me to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the splendid services these people are rendering our cause I feel that it is our duty to follow the action of France and in official and proper manner recognize the cause of their brethren across the sea, and give official recognition to the Czecho-Slovak, Jugo-Slovak, and Polish armies as well as the Czecho-Slovak, Jugo-Slovak, and Polish independence. The French Republic on December 16, 1917, issued the following decree, recognizing the cause for which I am now pleading:

DECREES.

Article I. Czecho-Slovaks organized in an autonomous army and recognizing from the military standpoint the supreme authority of the French high command will fight under their own flag against the Central Empires.

Article II. This national army is placed from the political standpoint under the direction of the National Council for Czech and Slovak Lands, with headquarters in Paris.

Article III. The equipment of the Czecho-Slovak Army, as well as its further maintenance, is assured by the French Government.

Article IV. Provisions governing the French Army as regards organization, military ranks, administration, and discipline are applicable to the Czecho-Slovak Army.

Article V. The autonomous Czecho-Slovak Army is recruited:

1. From Czecho-Slovaks actually serving in the French Army;
2. From Czecho-Slovaks of other jurisdictions who may be permitted to transfer to the Czecho-Slovak Army or who may volunteer for service in this army for the duration of the war.

Article VI. Further ministerial instructions will govern the application of this decree.

Article VII. The premier, the minister of war, and the minister of foreign affairs are charged, each in his own department, with the execution of this decree, which shall be published in the Journal Officiel of the French Republic and inserted in the Bulletin des Lois.

Done at Paris, the 16th day of December, 1917.

By the President of the Republic,

POINCARÉ.
PICHON,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.
CLEMENCEAU,
Premier and Minister of War.

Permit me also to insert, under the leave given me, the following solemn declaration of the General Assembly of the Bohemian Lands, held in Prague, January 6, 1918, which needs no explanation on my part:

[Solemn declaration of the General Assembly of the Bohemian Lands, held in Prague, Jan. 6, 1918.]

In the fourth year of the terrible war which has already cost such immense sacrifices of the wealth and blood of nations, the first tentative peace parleys are going on. We Czech members of the parliament, that parliament which has been by judgments of illegal military courts deprived of many of its Slav deputies; further, we Czech deputies to the dissolved and not renewed Diet of the Kingdom of Bohemia, together with deputies of the Diet of the Margravate of Moravia which has not been convened during the war, and of last Diet of the Duchy of Silesia, ratify the declarations of the Czech deputies in the parliament and we deem it our duty to declare emphatically on behalf of the Czech Nation and of her Slovak branch held down by Hungary our attitude toward the reconstruction of international relations.

When the Czech deputies of our then recently revived nation during the Franco-German War made a declaration with reference to the European international questions, they used in their resolutions of December 8, 1870, the following solemn words:

"All nations, the small as well as the great, have an equal right to self-determination, and their equality in this regard should be respected. Only by recognizing this equality and respecting the right of every nation to shape its own destiny can mankind establish true equality and brotherhood, general peace, and genuine humanity."

We, the deputies of the Bohemian Nation, faithful to these principles of our predecessors, greet with joy the fact that now all the States built on the principles of democracy, whether belligerent or neutral, agree with us in looking upon the right of nations to free self-determination as the guaranty of a general and lasting peace.

The new Russia also in her attempt for a general peace adopted the principle of the right of nations to self-determination as one of the fundamental conditions of peace; she urged that nations should freely choose their own mode of life and determine whether they will construct their own independent state or form one common state with other nations.

As against that the representative of Austria-Hungary on behalf of the four allies declared that the question of the self-determination of nations that have not at present an independent position in any existing state should be solved by constitutional means. We deem it our duty to declare on behalf of the Czech Nation that the attitude of the Austro-Hungarian representative is not our attitude. On the contrary we have opposed it in all our declarations and motions, because from our innumerable bitter experiences we see in it the total negation of

the principle of the self-determination of nations. We charge indignantly that our nation was robbed of her own independent state and of the right to determine her destinies and was placed by artfully contrived electoral schemes at the mercy of the German minority and made subject to the rule of German centralizing bureaucracy.

Our Slovak branch became a victim of Magyar brutality and unspeakable violence in a State which, in spite of its seemingly constitutional régime, has remained the darkest corner of Europe, and in which non-Magyar nations forming a majority, are oppressed and exterminated by the ruling minority, robbed of their children, without representation in parliament and administrative posts, without public schools, and deprived even of their private schools.

The constitution to which the Austro-Hungarian delegate appeals tampered even with the fairness of the universal manhood franchise by increasing artificially the representation of the German minority in parliament. Its absolute worthlessness, as far as the rights of the peoples are concerned, was demonstrated in an infamous manner by the brutal military absolutism during the war. Every reference to this constitution means in reality a denial of the right of self-determination of the non-German races of Austria, leaving them at the mercy of the Germans, and it means especially a coarse insult to the non-Magyar races of Hungary, where the constitution is merely the means by which the shameless oligarchy of a few high-born Magyar families maintains its rule, as has been once more proved by the last electoral-reform bill.

Our nation, like every other democracy of the world, desires a general and lasting peace. But it is fully conscious that only that peace will be lasting which will put an end to ancient wrongs, brutal force, and supremacy of cannon, as well as the rule of states and nations over other nations; that peace only will be lasting which will guarantee free development to nations great and small, and which will especially liberate those nations that are still subject to foreign dominion. It is therefore necessary that the right to a free national existence and self-determination of nations, great and small, of whatever State they may now be a part shall be the foundation of future international law, the guaranty of peace and friendly relations of nations, as well as the great ideal possession which will free humanity from the horrors of general war.

We, the representatives of the Bohemian Nation, declare that a peace which would not bring liberty to our nation could not and would not be for us peace, but only the beginning of a new, mighty, and thoroughgoing fight for political independence, in which our nation would employ to the utmost all its material and moral strength; and in this relentless struggle it would not pause until it reached its goal. Our nation reclaims this independence, relying upon its historical State right. It is pervaded by an ardent desire that it shall, in its own sovereign, equal, democratic, and socially just State, erected on the principle of equality of all the citizens and within the historical limits of its territories, together with its Slovak branch, contribute to the new growth of mankind, in free competition with other free nations, on the foundation of liberty and brotherhood, granting freely in this national State full and equal rights to racial minorities.

Guided by these principles, we protest solemnly against the rejection of the right of nations to self-determination at the peace conference. We demand that in accordance with this principle all nations, including our own, shall be guaranteed participation at the peace congress and full liberty to defend their rights.

I also desire to insert an article appearing in the Chicago Daily News which, no doubt, will be very interesting to many who are not familiar with the aims and aspirations of Bohemia:

CZECH AND SLOVAK FIGHT FOR VICTORY—PROF. EDWARD BENES TELLS OF THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS AND ASPIRATIONS.

[By John F. Bass, special correspondent of the Evening Star and the Chicago Daily News.]

PARIS, FRANCE, April 5.

Edward Benes, former professor of the University of Prague, Bohemia, and secretary general of the National Council of the Czechs on the international position of Bohemia in the Europe of the future, has prepared a statement on the aims of his nation and their relation to the war.

In reading the statement of Prof. Benes one should not be influenced by the present military situation to conclude that the article is the dream of a deluded idealist and patriot. The forces of national life are far more permanent than those of war. Even now Italy is moving toward a revolution in her policy of 40 years. In Rome there has just been held a convention of the national committees of Austrian Slavs with committees of leading Italians, French, and English. They favor a confederation of Slav States out of Austria-Hungary and an alliance of these with Italy. In 1848 the unity of the Italian nation was as far if not farther from realization than is that of this Slav federation.

Prof. Benes's statement is as follows:

WANT CZECHO-SLOVAK STATE.

"The Czechs and Slovaks have always been hostile to Austria and Germany, and now hope to free themselves by the present war. There are 12,000,000 of them, and they occupy about 40,000 square kilometers. The creation of an independent Czecho-Slovak State would create an insurmountable obstacle to the imperialistic program of the Germans and Magyars (Hungarians).

"This new State would be supported by the Polish State on the north and by the Jugo-Slav State on the south. With the support of Italy this confederation would form a strong barrier against German expansion in the east and south.

"The problem of central Europe would thus be solved in a favorable manner for the allies and a just balance of power would be established. The disappearance of the present Austria-Hungary—and the application of the principles of national independence leads to that logically—means the incalculable weakening of Germany, the abolition of an odious régime, and the end of continual disorder. But in order to erect the barrier it would be necessary to work out in central Europe a new political system which would replace the old Austria-Hungary now allied to Germany. In this system Bohemia would occupy an exceptional position. That position we are about to examine, taking into consideration the part that Italy will play in the Europe of the future.

BOHEMIA WOULD BE CENTER.

"The international position of Bohemia, because of her geographical situation, would be of primary importance for all European politics. Bohemia would be the center around which a certain number of States would group themselves. Their political needs would lead them toward a close union with the Czecho-Slovak State.

"To create an economic Czecho-Polish block means to erect an insurmountable obstacle to 'Mittel Europa.' The Czechs are sufficiently strong economically to defend themselves against Germany. They have at their disposal the vast economic territory of Poland, where they could find an outlet for their industries. They would, on the one hand, grow stronger, and, on the other hand, they would give Poland means of resistance against Germany's economic policy, and at the same time help Poland to create a national industry. This would give Bohemia a port for her use. Dantzig, once in Polish hands, would connect the economic life of Bohemia with the sea, and would associate Bohemia still more closely with Poland, which would be of mutual advantage to both. The political, economic, and moral interests of Poland and Bohemia being the same, there is no danger that Polish and Czech policies could ever be at variance.

"The Czecho-Polish combination would render absolutely impossible a new danger for western Europe—that is to say, the creating of a new triple alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Poland—a danger which would be real if Poland were left all alone at the side of Germany.

"A defensive political and economic alliance against Germany would inevitably be concluded also between the Czechs and Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs, when the latter are once free. An analogous policy would be put into effect with the Magyars in order to put them into a situation where they could do no more harm.

THEIR RELATIONS TO ITALY.

"In the question of the Adriatic and the relations between the Italians and the Jugo-Slavs, the Czechs and Slovaks are directly interested, and are formulating their ideas on both subjects in a very definite manner. This is how the question looks to them:

"The Czechs and Slovaks consider as one of the essential articles of their own political program the unification of all the Jugo-Slavs without exception.

"The best proof of premeditation on the part of Austria-Hungary is the way in which she has muzzled the non-German peoples, who have never participated in the plans of Berlin or Vienna, in order to assure the domination of the German race. Austria foresaw resistance and prepared for it in advance. Among the people from whom she had most to fear she counted the Czechs.

"Finally the Czech soldiers refused to fight for Austria. During the campaigns of Serbia and Galicia they succeeded in discouraging and demoralizing the Austro-Hungarian Army. To estimate properly the damage that they have done to the Austro-German cause it would be necessary to follow the conduct of the Czech soldiers in minute detail. This conduct of the Czech population and their soldiers led to savage reprisals on the part of the Austrian Government.

"All political life was suspended. The opposition parties were dissolved. All the principal leaders who had not succeeded in getting out of the country were put into prison. Everybody who was considered dangerous—professors, journalists, and publicists—was imprisoned or sent into terrible concentration camps, where life was worse than death.

REPRESENTED IN UNITED STATES.

"In America, Russia, Italy, and elsewhere there are sections of the council. It is above all due to the efforts of the Czechs of the United States that the movement has done so well. Over 1,500,000 Czechs and Slovaks are living in the United States, and at the beginning of the war they set themselves two tasks: First, to raise the necessary money from the Czech movement abroad, and, second, to work against German plans in the United States. In the first they have been successful, though enormous sums have been required. As for the second, the results of their efforts against Bernstorff, Boy-Ed, and other German spies are only beginning to be known.

"The crowning success of all this toil was the constitution of the national Czech and Slovak Army in France on December 16, 1917."

I also wish to insert extracts from a resolution of the Bohemian Socialist Party of America appealing to the Socialist Party of America, asking for the repeal of the resolution adopted at the St. Louis convention and declaring in favor of war against the central powers and for the crushing of German militarism and Austrian oppression, showing thereby the proper spirit, patriotism, and loyalty to our country, which appeal should by right be favorably considered by the Socialist Party, and that without delay:

To the Socialist Party of America:

The Bohemian Federation of the Socialist Party of America considers it its socialist duty to raise its voice at this time to the Socialist Party of America in an urgent appeal that she change her attitude toward the present war in this trying hour of struggle for democratic principles, and that she take a stand, after the example of labor parties in the allied nations, on the side of its own country. The Bohemian Federation of the Socialist Party and the organized Bohemian Workers in America generally felt from the very beginning of the war warm sympathies with the workers of the allied countries and approved their attitude toward the war. The Bohemian Federation of Socialist Party of America welcomed the grave voice of this country when she, after the outbreak of the Russian revolution, as if conscious of the trying moments that were to overtake the Russian people, arose to stand by the side of the young Russian democracy and thus to secure the victory of the Russian people.

The Bohemian Federation opposed, by a great majority of its votes, the well-known resolution of the St. Louis convention and thus testified unmistakably to its fundamentally different view of the present war.

The Bohemian Federation of the Socialist Party of America demands that the standpoint taken in the above referred to resolution be abandoned, for the development of affairs in Russia demonstrated beyond a shadow of doubt its untenability, and particularly the ideas expressed in the following declarations: "It is not a war against the militarist régime of the central powers." "It is not a war to advance the cause of democracy in Europe." "In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage."

We consider it our duty as socialists to urge most earnestly the Socialist Party in the United States to take, now, at least, in the interest of Russia, which is being strangled, an attitude of utmost seriousness, fully appreciative of the demands of this critical moment of history. Shall the great revolution that is marching through the world pass by without the proletariat of this country entering it as an active, progressive force?

We demand, with the full weight of our Socialist vote, that the Socialist Party of America declare in favor of the war against the central powers; that it offer this Republic all its loyal assistance and support against the outer and inner enemy everywhere, where the social and democratic interests of this country suffer in any way whatsoever.

Bohemian socialist workers always did and always will stand firmly upon this principle. In the war of nations, which was transformed into the greatest revolution of the suffering masses of humanity, we march on with our American Nation toward the great goal of a better future.

German militarism must be crushed, because "the world must be made safe for socialism and democracy."

Signed: Jos. Martinek (editor), Chas. Terlinger, Chas. Pinter, Belac (member of executive committee of Bohemian Federation), Josef Novak (editor in chief Daily Spravednost), Chas. Glaser, M. Martinkova, Fr. Hlavacek (editor), Jos. Jenik, Vojta Benes (author), L. Cimler (editor), Fr. V. Stuchal, K. Srettr, Fr. H. Gruener (editor of Daily Spravednost), Jan Juppa, A. V. Vesely (member executive committee Bohemian Federation), Tony Novotny (secretary of Bohemian Federation of the Socialist Party), Stephen Skala (business agent Amalgamated Garment Workers of America), J. Novotna, Ant. Svoboda, E. Horak, Fr. Horn, Fr. Brosta, Fr. Zivny (member of executive committee of Bohemian Federation).

CHICAGO, ILL., February 25, 1919.

Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate to the world that we stand by the President and that the entire country is united in this battle for freedom, democracy, and the independence of all nations, and calling attention to the memorable words of our President to the Congress of the United States on the eve of our entrance in this great conflict, wherein he said:

We shall fight for the things which we have carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the rights of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all peoples and make the world itself at last free.

I feel that it is our duty not only to adopt unanimously this resolution, but to also adopt a resolution giving assurance to the oppressed and dominated nations, who have suffered and are suffering to-day for the cause. That we recognize their aims and aspirations and that their cause is our cause and that we stand ready and willing to give them any and all assistance, the same as we are giving the allied forces, and will insist that all these nations shall have their deserved independence for which they have suffered and bled, sacrificed their lives and all. To that end, Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce a resolution providing for the recognition of their independence and assuring them of our loyal, undivided support. [Applause.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin to use some of his time now.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I inquire whether there will be more than one speech on the gentleman's side?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am going to yield one minute to my colleague, Mr. SMITH, to make a request, and then I shall use the three minutes remaining.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman wish me to yield one minute of my time?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I would be very much obliged for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, of the five minutes remaining, which I have in my control, I yield one of them to the gentleman from Texas for his use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill applies to two different classes, one aliens who have enlisted or been conscripted and the other those of certain nationalities who have joined separate organizations and are not a part of our National Army. The effect of this proviso as to the first class, as has been pointed out here, will be that you will be giving the aliens who have voluntarily enlisted in our National Army or who have been conscripted not only the compensation which is provided by the War Risk Insurance Bureau, which gives compensation to every enlisted man in the National Army, but you give him the additional advantage of maintenance and care on the part of the National Government. That shows the impracticability of legislating at this time on this great question as how the National Government should, if ever, take care of those who have received injuries in service abroad.

Further, under this proviso here the States could go to any extent in maintaining and caring for those individuals regardless, as I pointed out in my opening statement, as to the origin of the injury, and the National Government immediately will be obliged to pay every cent for their maintenance and care. We are not in a position to consider and we should not be considering at the present time the adoption of a policy by the National Government of maintaining and caring for aliens who have voluntarily enlisted or been conscripted, or for those declarants who have joined separate units apart from our Army who are fighting on the battle front. What should be done here is to vote down this motion to suspend the rules and then there will be no objection whatever to the consideration of this bill

without the proviso. I believe it will go through under unanimous consent, certainly under suspension of the rules. This idea of having the National Government for the first time bear the expenses of their care and maintenance, not if disabled in battle for any subsequent cause, should be gone over thoroughly by a committee so that we can provide for that situation, if at all, deliberately.

Is there anyone here who maintains that this is an opportune moment that the National Government should bear every item of the expense for maintenance and care of those persons who return to this country within one year after the outbreak of war? That shows beyond question that this proviso should be stricken out and then left to a subsequent committee to report on this separate provision. This proviso has nothing whatever to do with this bill. We all agree that these persons should have the right to be returned to this country regardless of the naturalization law. Why should this extraneous matter be brought in here by somebody, perhaps representing some seaport, who has not given full consideration to the subject? Let us vote down the motion to suspend the rule, and then this bill will go through with the proviso left out.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will now yield to the gentleman from Illinois, if I have any time remaining.

Mr. SABATH. I am not greatly interested in the proviso—

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I will ask unanimous consent—

Mr. SABATH. But I wish to state this, that before these men go over they are examined by three different physicians; they are subject to a full examination, and none but healthy men capable of service are taken abroad.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to suspend the rules be modified to the extent of suspending the rules and passing House joint resolution 255 with the proviso left out.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—I will have to object to that unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAKER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California objects.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH] for a minute.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 12, after the word "charge," insert the words "by reason of disability incurred in said service."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this proviso should be amended in many particulars, and for that reason I object.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to imperil the passage of the bill by insisting that the proviso remain. So far as I am concerned, therefore, I am willing to consent to have it stricken out in its entirety. I feel, however, that with the amendment which I have suggested the proviso ought to be inserted. There is no reason why local communities should have to bear the expense of maintaining men who have been fighting the enemies of the United States. And that is the reason why the provision was originally inserted in the measure.

Mr. CRAMTON. Many of the aliens covered by the proposed bill are serving in our own armies and are receiving the same pay as our own citizens serving beside them and are assured the same benefits accruing under our war-risk insurance act. If our own citizens are incapacitated for self-support by their military service the Federal Government assumes no responsibility for their support when they return home other than the aid given under the war-risk insurance act. Anything needed beyond that the local communities will have to supply. Why should the Federal Government extend to these aliens relief greater than it provides for our own citizens?

Mr. STAFFORD. These men are foreigners who, whether they volunteer or are conscripted, will, under the war-risk act, have a pensionable status.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, I wish to withdraw my objection to the application of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. I was opposed to this in the committee, and after it was reported out I thought I ought to maintain my position here on the floor. But I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] renews his request for unanimous consent to offer an amendment to strike out the proviso. Is there objection?

[After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the striking out of the proviso.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

WIDOWS' PENSIONS—AMENDING CHAPTER 470, STATUTES AT LARGE.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules for the purpose of passing the bill H. R. 9093.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9093) to amend the act approved September 8, 1916, chapter 470, Statutes at Large, Sixty-fourth Congress, relating to pensions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9093) to amend the act approved September 8, 1916, chapter 470, Statutes at Large, Sixty-fourth Congress, relating to pensions.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of Congress approved September 8, 1916, chapter 470, Statutes at Large, Sixty-fourth Congress, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That any widow of an officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War whose name was placed or shall hereafter be placed on the pension roll, under any existing law, and whose name has been or shall hereafter be dropped from said pension roll by reason of her marriage to another person who has since died or shall hereafter die, or from whom she has been heretofore or shall be hereafter divorced upon her own application and without fault on her part, shall be entitled to have her name again placed on the pension roll at the rate allowed by the law under which she was formerly pensioned, and the law or laws amendatory thereof, unless she be entitled to a greater rate of pension under the provisions of section 1 of this act, such pension to commence from the date of filing her application in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage of this act: *Provided, however,* That where the pension of said widow on her second or subsequent marriage has accrued to a helpless or idiotic child, or a child or children under the age of 16 years, she shall not be entitled to renewal under this act unless said helpless or idiotic child, or child or children under 16 years of age, be then a member or members of her family and cared for by her, and upon the renewal of pension to said widow payment of pension to said child or children shall cease: *And provided further,* That the provisions of this act shall be extended to those widows, otherwise entitled, whose husbands died of wounds, injuries, or disease incurred during the period of their military or naval service, but who were deprived of pension under the act of March 3, 1865, because of their failure to draw any pension by reason of their remarriage, and to any person who was lawfully married to an officer or enlisted man, who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War and was honorably discharged therefrom and has since deceased, and who, having remarried since his death is again a widow, or has been divorced from her last husband upon her own application without fault on her part and who, otherwise entitled, was barred by reason of such remarriage from receiving pension under any existing law, or was barred by reason of her having married the soldier subsequent to June 27, 1890.

"This section shall apply to cases where there has been one, or more than one, marriage after the death of the soldier, if it be shown that such successive marriage was dissolved by the death of the husband or by divorce upon the application of the wife and without fault on her part; and this section shall apply to claims filed subsequent to September 8, 1916."

REAPPOINTMENT OF CONFERE.

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman from Ohio begins, the other day the Chair was informed that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], who was one of the conferees on a House bill, was away and probably would not be back, and he appointed the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY]. It turns out that Mr. AUSTIN got back here on Saturday and actually signed the conference report, and therefore the Chair revokes the appointment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] and reappoints the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. LANGLEY. Which is perfectly satisfactory to the "gentleman from Kentucky."

WIDOWS' PENSIONS—AMENDING CHAPTER 470, STATUTES AT LARGE.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks only to clear up and carry out the original intent of Congress when it passed the widows' pension bill. The widows' bill was passed by the House on June 17, 1916, by the Senate on September 7, and signed by the

President and became a law on September 8, 1916. I might state that it was the last bill signed by the President before the adjournment of that session of Congress. I believe that I am qualified to speak with some little knowledge and authority when I say it was the intent and understanding of the Congress to do the things this bill now before you will accomplish. I make this statement because I prepared and introduced the bill. I was a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions which considered the bill and reported it to the House. I appeared before the Senate Pension Committee and explained the provisions of the bill to the Senate committee. The report of the Senate committee was almost a verbatim report of the House report, so that it is evident that both the House and Senate had a like understanding of the intent and purposes of the bill. This bill before you to-day, therefore, really contains no new legislation and ought not be long debated or receive a single negative vote. I will therefore be as brief as possible in explaining as best I can the bill now under consideration.

The act of September 8, 1916, undertook to pension four classes of Civil War widows. Only two, however, are under consideration at this time, as the other two provisions of the original bill were satisfactorily construed by the Pension Department. It was clearly intended to pension remarried widows, but the Commissioner of Pensions held, after a large number of cases had been favorably considered and placed upon the pension roll, that a widow who contracted more than one marriage was not entitled to a pension under the Ashbrook law.

If you will refer to the letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, printed in the report accompanying this bill, you will observe that the ruling of the Pension Department was not sustained by the Interior Department until March 27, 1917, and before that decision was announced a large number of claims of widows who had contracted more than one marriage had been allowed and are now on the pension rolls and receiving a pension. Possibly 1,500 or more widows whose claims were not allowed before the decision was made are therefore denied a pension, although their cases are just as meritorious and deserving as those who were fortunate enough to have their claims allowed. This is an injustice that I am sure you will desire to rectify.

I regret that it has been so long delayed. One thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine soldiers' widows died during March last, and, like the old veterans, they are dying very rapidly. I have been striving ever since the adverse ruling was made to have this measure brought before the House, but during the extra session last summer, as you all know, it was impossible to bring any legislation before the House except war legislation. I have been striving ever since December to get this bill up, as the Speaker will corroborate, but, like many other important bills, it had to give way to war measures and bills considered more important. However, I am glad at this late hour to have the opportunity to bring this bill to the attention of the Congress, and I am sure that it will be passed without objection. I am sure that you all appreciate how much these poor women need the pension justly due them in these days of high prices when we can hardly make ends meet on our own salaries. Nearly all are old and unable to properly support themselves. We have to-day given the old soldiers a substantial increase in their pensions by the passage of the Sherwood bill, and now before this good day is ended let us correct the injustice that has been done these faithful old widows who have not benefited by the law which I am proud to have bear my name. There is no dispute on the part of anyone here that it was the intention of Congress that all Civil War widows who were married previous to June 27, 1905, to an honorably discharged soldier who had served 90 days should be pensioned regardless of the number of times she had married.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will.

Mr. LANGLEY. I think—and I base my opinion upon a careful reading of that decision—that technically the commissioner's ruling was probably correct. But I think it was too rigid a construction of the act. If you will make a careful analysis of the language of your original act, I believe that, as a lawyer, you will agree that as a purely legal proposition the ruling was correct, although it was not the intention of the committee or of Congress, of course, that the bill should be so construed.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I think that everybody who gave this bill any consideration knows that it was not the intention of the Congress to bar widows who had contracted more than one marriage. But the unfortunate thing about the bill was that it was written in the singular and not in the plural. If it had read "more than one marriage" or "person or persons," the plural and not the singular, the Commissioner of Pensions advised me that this adverse ruling would not have been made.

Mr. SNOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do.

Mr. SNOOK. Has my colleague any information as to how many widows this will affect? Has he any figures on the subject?

Mr. ASHBROOK. If I am not mistaken, the Commissioner of Pensions told me there are about 1,500 widows who have been denied a pension because they had contracted more than one marriage.

Mr. SNOOK. A small number.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; a very small number.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. What amount of money will the Treasury be required to pay out to make good the proposed pensions intended to be allowed by this bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am unable to tell the gentleman just how much money it will cost, but the amount will be insignificant. It was clearly the intention of Congress to give these widows a pension, and whether it will cost \$100,000 or \$1,000,000 or more, I do not think Congress ought to hesitate to put the correct interpretation upon this law.

Mr. ROBBINS. It is a matter of having the construction placed on the law that was the original intention of Congress when the bill was passed.

Mr. ASHBROOK. There is no doubt but it was the original intention of Congress to include remarried widows or widows who contracted more than one marriage.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Commissioner of Pensions estimates that there will be about 1,500 benefited. They are now drawing \$20 under the Ashbrook bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman is mistaken; some may be drawing \$12 under the old law, but the majority are not now on the pension roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be an increase of \$8 per month. You can multiply that by 1,500.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It will certainly include many widows who are not now on the pension rolls.

Mr. ROBBINS. These widows that you propose to pension now are not on the pension roll at all. Is not that the fact?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The great majority are not on the pension roll at all.

Mr. ROBBINS. They go on the roll at \$25?

Mr. ASHBROOK. They go on at \$25.

Mr. LANGLEY. A good many may have been at some time on the roll and forfeited the pension by remarriage. Then they remarried again, without having been restored to the rolls, as they could not under existing law. It was, of course, our intention to include these, and that is what the pending bill does.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. The intention of this bill is to correct a technical error in the former bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes. That is all.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not quite agree with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] in his statement. To my mind, had the Bureau of Pensions given the former legislation just an ordinarily liberal construction this bill would not be necessary. Their decision was based upon the word "widow" up in the beginning of the section; but there was language in the bill that would fully describe just the people whom the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is now trying to reach; such language as this—

That any person who was lawfully married to an officer or enlisted man who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the Civil War and was honorably discharged therefrom and has since deceased, and who, having remarried since his death is again a widow.

There is no limitation as to the number of remarriages; and if there is any virtue in the matter of being remarried, then these widows who remarry twice after the death of the soldier ought to be more sure of a pension than the others. It was only on the strictest policy of construction imaginable that the department made its ruling. I have been in sympathy with the gentleman's efforts. I know how carefully he has worked to right this injustice, and I hope he may succeed with his measure to-day.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] for what he has had to say, and I wish to inform the House that the gentleman from Michigan appeared with me before the Assistant Secretary of the Interior to argue this very case, and I know that he has also made every effort that he could to have the correct interpretation placed upon this law.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I desire to indorse the gentleman's statement, as to the activity of both the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook].

Mr. ASHBROOK. And I am also glad to include the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Langley] and any other gentleman who desires to join with me in helping these needy old women who tenderly and faithfully looked after the comfort and welfare of some old soldier who gallantly responded to his country's call in those dark days of more than a half century ago.

Mr. LANGLEY. I thank the gentleman; but what I wished to say, Mr. Speaker, was that the statement of the gentleman from Michigan does not in fact conflict with what I said, which was, that while I thought it was too strict a construction, technically the commissioners' ruling was correct, and the fact that it had been sustained by the law officers of the Interior Department sustains what I am saying. I served with some of them for several years, and I know they have some excellent legal talent. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cramton] is a very able, level-headed man, but I believe he is not a lawyer. I agree with him that the broad, common-sense, liberal view that should be taken of these pension statutes would have warranted the opposite construction, but technically the construction was correct, following the rule of strict construction, which ought not to obtain in cases like this.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I want the House to understand that the Commissioner of Pensions, before this ruling was made, allowed a large number of claims of widows who had contracted more than one marriage, and those widows are now on the pension roll and receiving pensions. After this adverse ruling was made, widows who had contracted more than one marriage were denied a pension. I do not criticize the Commissioner of Pensions, who is an old soldier himself, and I know is friendly to pensions and pension legislation, but must, of course, execute the laws with justice and impartiality. Mr. Saltzgaber has cordially cooperated with me to have the Ashbrook law amended, as is evidenced by the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, December 12, 1917.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ASHBROOK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ASHBROOK: Knowing how you felt about the exclusion of some widows of soldiers who had, after the soldier's death, contracted more than one marriage, I am sending you herewith a provision which contains pertinent language, prepared by one of the most competent persons in the Pension Bureau, to effect the purpose of putting all of those widows upon the roll and to give them the benefit of the pension laws.

This proviso could be inserted as an amendment to the end of section 2 of the act of September 8, 1916, of which you were the author, or it could be added as a clause in the pension appropriation bill.

The decision of the Secretary overruling the Lamb decision occurred March 27, 1917. Before that, under the former practice of the Pension Bureau, there had been placed on the roll a large number of widows who had been married twice or more subsequent to the death of the soldier husband. They were allowed to remain on the pension roll under the well-known rule that decisions arrived at under a former interpretation of the law would not be disturbed. Now we have the anomalous situation of perhaps five or six hundred women, under those circumstances, being upon the roll and receiving the benefit of the said act of September 8, 1916, while there are many hundreds of other women under like circumstances who are excluded.

It will please me very much if you are able to remedy this situation and allow them all to go upon the pension roll.

Cordially, yours,

G. M. SALTZGABER, Commissioner.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield in that connection?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under what construction of law does the Commissioner of Pensions deny applicants who have married more than once and yet retain on the pension roll several hundred others having the same status who have been awarded pensions? If there is no authority of law for granting pensions to the applicants, why is there authority of law to pay out money to those who have been granted pensions under an erroneous construction of the law?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Under what the commissioner claims to be an erroneous construction of the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under what the commissioner claims to be an erroneous construction of the law.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is the policy of the Pension Department that when a

claim has been allowed if some other construction of the law is later made the claims that have been allowed will not be disturbed.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many are now on the pension rolls who are receiving pensions under former constructions of the law where subsequent constructions would not entitle them to pensions?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have no doubt that there are a great many. In this particular instance I believe there are more who are now receiving pensions under the first construction of the widows' law than will be benefited by the passage of this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a very peculiar administration of the pension law, that when a department head construes the law to mean that there is no warrant for a certain payment of money they will continue to pay the money out to persons in an identical status, but will decline to pay to those who apply subsequently.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say further to the gentleman that I have here a letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, dated December 12, 1917, from which I quote:

The decision of the Secretary, overruling the Lamb decision, occurred March 27, 1917. Before that, under the former practice of the Pension Bureau, there had been placed on the roll a large number of widows who had been married twice or more, subsequent to the death of the soldier husband. They were allowed to remain on the pension roll under the well-known rule that decisions arrived at under a former interpretation of the laws would not be disturbed.

Mr. BURNETT. Has that been the uniform rule?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; I believe it has.

Mr. BURNETT. I know a number of Confederate soldiers who were taken out at Rock Island and sent to fight on the frontier, and the commissioner first held that they were entitled to a pension. HOKE SMITH decided that they were not, and they were taken off the roll. Another commissioner decided that they were, and they were put back onto the roll; another commissioner decided differently, and they were stricken off the roll; and then another decided another way, and they were put on and are still there.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Possibly, the gentleman is right. I know of one or two instances where the soldiers were on the roll, but were stricken off and are not now receiving a pension.

Mr. LANGLEY. I want to say that those cases are of an entirely different character. There was involved in those cases questions that are not in any sense on all fours with this case.

Mr. BURNETT. There is one further question I desire to ask. Is this bill retroactive? Under a correct interpretation of the law, would it give those widows pensions who would have been entitled to a pension?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The original act says that the pension shall begin from the filing of the application. My opinion is that if this interpretation which we seek to put upon the act becomes a law they will receive a pension from the time they file their application.

Mr. FIELDS. If there is any question about the construction, ought it not be remedied in the bill?

Mr. LANGLEY. There can be no question of construction about it, as I understand it. The author of the bill and the Pension Office officials have agreed upon the phraseology that will accomplish the objects we have in view.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The original law says from the date of the application. Of course, widows who have not filed an application would not receive a pension until they did file the application.

Mr. FIELDS. Why should it not say following their application under the law of 1916? Many of them had filed applications but they were rejected for the reason that they were married twice.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Those who have filed their applications will hardly be required to file another application.

Mr. FIELDS. That is what I wanted to be sure of.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Does not the gentleman think that the bill ought to read that such pensions shall commence from the date of filing the application in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage of this act as herein amended? Because Congress has not passed a law authorizing this, or it would not be passing it now.

Mr. LANGLEY. This is a bill to construe the other act.

Mr. BLACK. Will not the gentleman ask unanimous consent to modify the bill so that the claims will date from the passage of the act as herein amended?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I should object to that. The effect of that would be to keep out all of those widows who remarried from the time of the adverse ruling up to this time. All those claims are now pending, and it would be absolutely unjust.

Why should they be kept out; why discriminate in favor of some and not others?

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not understand that that would be the effect of it. If it is, I am against it, of course.

Mr. ASHBROOK. As I understand, the gentleman's object is to do the very thing that the bill will do.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The gentleman from Texas says "after the passage of the amended act." That would cut out all those who had contracted marriage in the meantime.

Mr. FIELDS. You might say "after the passage of the act of 1916." Was it not the gentleman's opinion that the widows would be pensioned under the other act?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; but I will admit that, in the light of my past experiences, I am not much of a prophet on the construction the legal department of the Pension Office may take on this or any other pension bill.

Mr. FIELDS. Can the gentleman tell how the Pension Bureau will construe it?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say to the gentleman that I first introduced a bill and submitted it to the Commissioner of Pensions. He reviewed it, made suggestions relative to the things I sought to do, and I then acted upon his suggestions and re-introduced the bill, and it has the approval of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I call the gentleman's attention to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Texas. If he desires to accomplish what he seeks by his suggestion, he must do it by adding another section to the bill. He could not jump it into the middle of the bill in the manner he seeks to do without affecting the interpretation of the entire measure in other particulars.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, before I reserve the balance of my time I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry. The bill as reprinted after it was reported to the House contains an error. On page 3, line 16, the word "each" occurs, when it should read "such"; and, if necessary to offer an amendment, I wish to now offer it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to correct the wording of the bill, which the Clerk will report. The Clerk says that in the print that he has there is no word "each" in line 16.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is, line 21.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Evidently I have a different print.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman thinks the word "each" ought to be substituted for the word "such"?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the confusion is due to the fact that the bill was first placed on the House calendar and was stricken from that calendar and placed on the Union Calendar, which changed the lines.

The SPEAKER. Which bill is it that the gentleman has?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I did have the bill which was on the House Calendar, and the amendment should properly come in line 21 of the bill on the Union Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. How much time for debate is there on each side of this question?

The SPEAKER. Twenty minutes. The gentleman from Ohio has used up his time, but the Chair thought he would put this motion if he could find out where it is.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the bill on the Union Calendar No. 8, report No. 254, on page 3, line 21, the word "such" should be "each."

Mr. CRAMTON. Does not the gentleman think the language should be "each such successive marriage," using both words?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am quite willing to take the advice and suggestion of the Commissioner of Pensions. He called my attention to this error in the reprint of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 21, strike out the word "such" and insert the word "each."

The SPEAKER. Is that the way the gentleman wants it?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is it.

Mr. CANNON. Does this take care of the widow who has married the third time?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; or the fourth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to offering this amendment?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], who desires to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion which has been made to suspend the rules and pass this bill be modified so as to provide for an amendment on line 17, page 2, after the word "this," by adding the word "amended," so that it will read "after the passage of this amended act."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is aware that we are amending section 2 of the act passed on September 8, 1916.

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. There might be applications pending under other classes to which the amendment of the committee has no relevancy whatever, and at the present time have not been adjudicated, and yet with the gentleman's amendment they would be denied a pension until this amended act was passed. The gentleman will realize the injustice that would be done under that condition.

Mr. BLACK. What I am trying to do is to prevent an injustice that will be done to the Treasury if the amended act we are about to pass is made a retroactive act, and these pensions that have been disallowed are dated back to the time of filing the claim in the Pension Bureau after the passage of the original act. I do not think that should be done, but that all such classes of claims should date from the passage of this amended act.

Mr. LANGLEY. Where would the injustice come in?

Mr. BLACK. Because Congress has never passed any law of that kind, and it takes this law to give them that status. The very fact that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has reported this bill is sufficient proof within itself that the classes of claims which it is intended to cover now have no pensionable status.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems clear to me that this bill, if it is passed, ought to deal fairly as between all persons who are entitled to pensions; that the widows who have applied heretofore and have been denied pensions under what was clearly an unwise construction, because it was a construction contrary to the intention of this House, should not be discriminated against, while others who applied at an earlier date have been carried on the pension rolls despite this ruling. I suggest that we amend the bill by adding section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. Pensions granted under this act shall be payable and paid from the date of the filing of the application therefor heretofore or hereafter.

That makes the act take effect from the time of the filing of the application, and it puts all applicants on the same basis. Of course they should not have a pension until they have applied for it. They should be reasonably diligent, but, on the other hand, the bureau should not be continually giving unwise or unjust or unfair rulings—rulings contrary to the intention of this House.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Of course it could not be section 3, because the original bill has section 3. The gentleman will have to add another paragraph to this bill or else make it section 2 of this bill. He could not have section 3, because there is a section 3.

Mr. DEMPSEY. What would the gentleman suggest?

Mr. WALSH. Simply add another paragraph.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Add as a paragraph, striking out section 3?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It seems to me that the amendment suggested would make the bill fair, just, and reasonable as between the various applicants. It would carry out the intention of this House. We ought to insist with the department when we pass a law that we are going to have it construed according to its purpose, according to a fair interpretation of the language, according to what the House intended to do, and in passing this amendment we are simply insisting upon a construction of that kind.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Would the gentleman change the present bill?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I do not know whether the amendment changes it or not, but it does make it plain.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under the present bill they get it from the time of the application, whether before or after.

Mr. DEMPSEY. You might get it and you might not; this is to make the meaning plain and beyond question.

Mr. FIELDS. According to the gentleman's amendment they would get it from the time the application is filed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. According to the language in lines 15 and 16, page 2—

Mr. DEMPSEY. This is to avoid any question as to construction. My experience with the bureau has been that it gives the most narrow and the most illiberal construction it can, and if we give them this language it seems to me we will not have any doubt about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I misunderstood the purpose of the gentleman from Texas when I indicated my concurrence in the amendment he suggested a while ago. Now that I understand the purport of it, I am opposed to it, and I am in favor of the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEMPSEY], because there is no question but what it would be a rank injustice to permit this misconstruction of what was the clear purpose of the committee and of the Congress in passing the act of 1916, to deprive those who were the victims of the commissioner's ruling of what we intended them to have and what many other remarried widows have in fact received, whose cases are exactly the same.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. In a moment. To deprive some widows of part of the benefits of this act of September 8, 1916, while others are not so discriminated against, would be unjust and indefensible. Now I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will give the gentleman an illustration of the kind of construction that we get in the Pension Department. A man was discharged from the service and his discharge certificate stated his age. The day he was born of course affects his pensionable status, the amount to be paid depending upon his age, and the Pension Department refuses to accept that certificate of discharge which gives his age at the time when there was no object at all in stating it falsely by an officer charged with that duty, and they substitute for it and instead of it the census age which they say was taken at a certain time in that locality.

Mr. LANGLEY. I agree with the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, in his statement that the department is too rigid in construing the pension laws sometimes, and the case the gentleman gives is one illustration of it, and its construction of the Ashbrook Act is another. I thought the gentleman from Ohio had consulted the bureau, and had so framed the bill that there could be no question about the retroactive effect of the bill, so as to give a pension to all remarried widows, regardless of the number of remarriages, as we really intended by the act of 1916, and date the pension back so as to put them all on the same footing, and if there is any doubt about that as the bill is now phrased, I think the amendment suggested by the gentleman from New York ought to be adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make this statement to the House. After further reading and considering this bill, I am of the opinion that the pension will begin from the date of the filing of the application under this amended law, because, if you read lines 15 and 17, the language states:

Such pension to commence from the date of filing her application in the Bureau of Pensions after the passage of this act.

Mr. LANGLEY. That was not the intention of the author of the bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That was not the intention, and I think it should be amended so that the pension will begin from the filing of the application under the old law.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 7, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Public Health Service in the treatment of patients for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1078); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Department of State for printing and binding for the Pan American Union, fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. 1079); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Department of State for contingent expense, foreign missions, fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1080); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of Labor submitting a proposed paragraph of legislation extending for the fiscal year 1919 the appropriation made in the act of March 28, 1918, for advancing transportation to wage earners (H. Doc. No. 1081); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War submitting a proposed clause of legislation authorizing the accounting officers of the Treasury Department to allow and credit in the accounts of Capt. (now Lieut. Col., National Army) Arthur P. Watts, United States Army the sum of \$66.11, disallowed against him on the books of the Treasury (H. Doc. No. 1082); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Engineer Department of the Army for the protection of the reservation at Sandy Hook, N. J., fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1083); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. RAKER, from the Committee on Woman Suffrage, to which was referred the bill (S. 2380) granting to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii additional powers relative to elections and qualifications of electors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 536), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MONTAGUE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11552) granting the consent of Congress to Marlon and Horry Counties to construct a bridge across Little Pee Dee River, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 538), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SHALLENBERGER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4818) requiring the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to Benjamin R. Buffington, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 537), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 11945) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products"; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 11946) to limit mileage to actual expenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11947) requiring all pensioners to reside within the territorial limits of the United States; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 11948) granting the consent of Congress to the Great Southern Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, doing business in the State of Mississippi, to construct a bridge across Pearl River, at or near the north line of section 22, township 8 north, range 21 west, west of the basis meridian, in the land district east of Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11949) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Pearl River, Mississippi, and the fourth ward of the parish of Washington, La., to construct a bridge across Pearl River, between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11950) to change the names of certain municipalities, counties, townships, streets, and highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 11951) to add certain lands to the national forests in the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 11952) to grant free transportation to enlisted men in the military or naval service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 11953) granting a pension to widows of soldiers, sailors, or marines who served in the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 338) authorizing the Committee on Accounts to expend a sum sufficient to procure a flag designed in accordance with the act of April 4, 1818; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) extending the provisions of act approved December 20, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize absence by homestead settlers and entrymen, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 11954) granting an increase of pension to William A. Pullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11955) granting a pension to Margaret J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 11956) granting a pension to John M. Hedrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 11957) for the relief of Dorothea V. Stillman; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 11958) granting a pension to John G. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11959) granting a pension to James T. Breen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 11960) granting a pension to Gertrude Ballou; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANSFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11961) granting a pension to Mary A. McBride; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 11962) granting a pension to Mary Jane Chamberlain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 11963) granting a pension to Hugh McGuckian; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 11964) for the relief of the P. J. Carlin Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 11965) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Bacon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 11966) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWIFT: A bill (H. R. 11967) granting a pension to Fanny Weill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 11968) for the relief of James Cahoon; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 11969) for the relief of the owner of the steamship *Matoa*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Resolutions of the Milwaukee Clearing House Association, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 4426 to require Government guaranty of bank deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the warden, Michigan State prison, protesting against the passage of House bill 9683, relating to the use of prison labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of Maple Valley Council, No. 4, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of Glover, Vt., favoring the passage of House bill 10846, fixing a one-third fare rate to enlisted men on furlough; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of State Mountain Grange, No. 297, Patrons of Husbandry, Bellows Falls, Vt., for the repeal of the postal zone law relating to second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Resolutions of the 26 clubs of the Berrien County (Mich.) Federation, protesting against the grazing of sheep in the national parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of citizens of the first congressional district of Oregon in connection with House bill 8625; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial of the City Council, Los Angeles, Cal., adopted at its meeting April 29, 1918, in favor of legislation which will make impossible separate organizations of citizens of Germany and Austria in the United States during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAKER: Pledge cards of the Food Administration signed by three women of Red Bluff, Cal.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution adopted by the California State Conference of Social Agencies urging prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 7, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we desire to approach Thee in deep humility of soul. Thou art the great God who inhabiteth eternity. Thou art the creator of all worlds, the preserver of all things, and the Judge of all men. Thou hast a right, therefore, to demand our service. May we render unto Thee the glory which is due unto Thy name. Day by day may we walk under the shadow of the Almighty.

Bless Thy servants as they enter upon the task of this day. Give them wisdom and grace to meet the great responsibilities under which they rest. In this awful time, when the eye of the world is upon our Congress, help Thy servants to act well their part; and may the glad day be near when the angels shall sing again their triumphant song, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men; and Thy name shall be praised, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM MISSOURI.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have the honor to present the credentials of Hon. XENOPHON P. WILFLEY, recently appointed a Senator from the State of Missouri to succeed the late Senator WILLIAM J. STONE. I send the credentials to the desk and ask that they be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Missouri, I, Frederick D. Gardner, governor of said State, do hereby appoint XENOPHON P. WILFLEY a Senator of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of WILLIAM JOEL STONE, is filled by election as provided by law.

In testimony whereof I hereunto set my hand and cause to be affixed the great seal of the State of Missouri. Done at the city of Jefferson, this 30th day of April, A. D. 1918.

By the governor:

FREDERICK D. GARDNER.
JOHN L. SULLIVAN,
Secretary of State.

[SEAL.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection the newly appointed Senator will present himself at the desk and take the oath of office.